

**HUNGER IN AMERICA 2010
Local Report Prepared for
Second Harvest Inland
Northwest - Clark County
(4803)**

Final Report

January 2010

*James Mabli
Rhoda Cohen
Frank Potter
Zhanyun Zhao*

Submitted to:

Feeding America
35 E. Wacker Drive, Suite 2000
Chicago, IL 60601

George Braley
*Senior Vice President of Government
Relations and Public Policy*

Maura Daly
*Vice President of Government
Relations and Advocacy*

Elaine Waxman
Director of Research and Analysis
Emily Engelhard
Manager of Social Policy Research and Analysis

Submitted by:

Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
(609) 799-3535

Rhoda Cohen
Project Director

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the strong support and vision of the staff at Feeding America, George Braley, Maura Daly, Elaine Waxman, Emily Engelhard, and Lindsey Baker, who provided strong support throughout the research process. The quality of the product was also much improved through sound advice from the Technical Advisory Group: John Cook, Jim Ohls, Rob Santos, Chris Gundersen, Beth Osborne Daponte, and Steve Carlson. We also acknowledge the contributions of the Member Advisory Committee, Mariann Guinn, Karen Joyner, Jeff Dronkers, Nicholas Saccaro, Erin Rockhill, JC Dwyer and Kristen Yandora, in the review of the data collection instruments and procedures.

Also, a number of staff from Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) made important contributions, which contributed to the success of the project. Frank Potter, working with Zhanyun Zhao, developed and implemented the sampling plan and developed the analysis weights for the project, with the assistance of Yuhong Zheng, Cathy Lu and Shinu Verghese. MPR internal advisors, including Laura Castner and John Hall, made many important suggestions for the analysis and reports.

On the survey side, Marcia Comly and Laurie Bach spent long hours obtaining the sample frames from the food banks and providing feedback to them throughout the sampling process. The data they obtained were placed in a comprehensive computer tracking database developed by Shilpa Khambati and Roland Scurato. David Eden worked tirelessly to update and produce the training video for affiliates to use in training large numbers of field interviewers. Andrea Smith made significant contributions to the series of webinars supporting the development of the sample frame and the in-person training sessions for the Hunger Study Coordinators. Andrea Sleeper provided on-going support for the distribution of data collection materials to the food banks.

Marcia Tobias, Pat Barta, Cynthia Campbell, Cheryl Lichtenstein, Leslie Randall, Lorraine Davis, Linda Warren, and Brandon Wentworth, under the supervision of Ae Sengmavong, Season Bedell-Boyle and Marcia Tobias provided guidance to the food banks' Hunger Study Coordinators. Jessica Boehm played a key role in reviewing and preparing the completed client questionnaires for shipment to Questar for electronic data capture.

Jeffrey Holt, Ira Nichols-Barrer, and Elizabeth Petraglia provided critical and advanced programming and analysis skills needed to produce the report. Carlo Caci offered extraordinary computer skills in enhancing and implementing a system to expeditiously generate national, local, state, and special analysis database. Dawn Patterson provided exceptional secretarial support throughout the process. The competency and flexibility demonstrated by all involved were key factors in the success of the project.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS	1
2. INTRODUCTION	5
2.1 OBJECTIVES	7
2.2 OVERVIEW OF THE FEEDING AMERICA NETWORK.....	8
2.3 GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY	12
2.4 OVERVIEW OF THE REST OF REPORT	13
3. METHODS.....	15
3.1 INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT	15
3.2 TRAINING	15
3.3 AGENCY SURVEY	16
3.4 CLIENT SURVEY	19
3.5 RESPONSE RATES	23
3.6 ANALYSIS METHODS	27
3.6.1 Tables	27
3.6.2 Other Methodological Considerations.....	29
3.7 REPORTING CONVENTIONS IN FOOD BANK REPORTS.....	34
4. ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF AGENCIES AND CLIENTS	37
4.1 ESTIMATED NUMBER OF AGENCIES	37
4.2 ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CLIENTS	38
4.3 BACKGROUND AND LIMITATIONS OF THE ESTIMATES	39
5. CLIENTS: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE.....	43
5.1 NUMBER OF CLIENT RESPONDENTS	43
5.2 SUMMARY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	45

CONTENTS (*continued*)

Chapter	Page
5.3 AGE, GENDER, AND CITIZENSHIP COMPOSITION	48
5.4 MARITAL STATUS	54
5.5 HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL ATTAINED	55
5.6 RACIAL AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND	57
5.7 EMPLOYMENT OF ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD	59
5.8 HOUSEHOLD INCOME	64
5.8.1 Federal Poverty Level	64
5.8.2 Household Income for the Previous Month	65
5.8.3 Sources of Household Income for the Previous Month	69
5.8.4 Annual Household Income in 2008.....	74
5.8.5 Education and Income in 2008.....	77
5.8.6 Presence of Elderly or Children and Income in 2008	79
5.9 HOUSING.....	81
5.9.1 Housing Status.....	81
5.9.2 Household Resources	87
6. CLIENTS: FOOD INSECURITY.....	89
6.1 HOUSEHOLD FOOD INSECURITY	91
6.1.1 Household Food Insecurity and Household Composition.....	91
6.1.2 Household Food Insecurity and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation.....	100
6.1.3 Household Food Insecurity and Household Income	103
6.1.4 Household Food Insecurity and Health	106
6.1.5 Household Food Insecurity and Citizenship Status.....	107

CONTENTS (*continued*)

Chapter	Page
6.2 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY IN HOUSEHOLDS.....	109
6.3 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG ADULTS.....	113
6.4 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN	118
6.5 CHOICE BETWEEN FOOD AND NECESSITIES	124
7. CLIENTS: USE OF FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.....	133
7.1 USE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.....	133
7.2 REASONS WHY CLIENTS NEVER APPLIED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS	140
7.3 REASONS WHY CLIENTS OR THEIR HOUSEHOLDS ARE NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, FOR THOSE WHO HAVE APPLIED	146
7.4 USE OF OTHER PROGRAMS.....	152
7.5 GENERAL ASSISTANCE, WELFARE, AND TANF IN THE PREVIOUS TWO YEARS.....	155
7.6 GROCERY SHOPPING PATTERNS.....	156
8. CLIENTS: HEALTH STATUS	159
8.1 HEALTH STATUS	159
8.2 HEALTH INSURANCE AND ACCESS TO MEDICAL CARE.....	162
9. CLIENTS: SERVICES RECEIVED AT FOOD PROGRAMS.....	167
9.1 NUMBER OF PANTRIES OR KITCHENS USED	167
9.2 SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES AT FOOD PROGRAMS	169
9.3 WHAT CLIENTS WOULD DO WITHOUT FOOD ASSISTANCE FROM THE AGENCY	172
10. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: PROFILES	175

CONTENTS *(continued)*

Chapter	Page
10.1 PARTICIPATING AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS REPRESENTED	175
10.2 NUMBER OF PROGRAMS OPERATED BY AGENCIES	178
10.3 AGENCIES OPERATING VARIOUS TYPES OF PROGRAMS.....	179
10.4 LENGTH OF PROGRAM OPERATION	179
10.5 OTHER SERVICES OR FACILITIES PROVIDED IN ADDITION TO FOOD DISTRIBUTION.....	182
10.6 TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM	187
10.7 PROGRAMS SERVING SELECTED TYPES OF CLIENTS	189
10.8 AGENCY ESTIMATES OF CHANGE IN NUMBER OF CLIENTS FROM 2006 TO 2009	191
10.9 SEASONALITY OF CLIENT MIX.....	192
11. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: FOOD SERVICES.....	195
11.1 NUMBER OF BOXES OR BAGS DISTRIBUTED IN A TYPICAL WEEK.....	195
11.2 AMOUNT OF FOOD SERVED ON THE DAY THE PROGRAM WAS LAST OPEN	197
12. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: ABILITY TO MEET CLIENT NEEDS	201
12.1 STABILITY OF EXISTING FOOD PROGRAMS	201
12.2 FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES.....	206
12.3 PROGRAMS THAT TURNED AWAY CLIENTS.....	211
12.4 ADDITIONAL FOOD RESOURCES NEEDED PER WEEK.....	215
13. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: RESOURCES	217
13.1 SOURCES OF FOOD DISTRIBUTED BY PROGRAMS.....	217
13.2 STAFF AND VOLUNTEER RESOURCES DURING PREVIOUS WEEK ..	223

CONTENTS (*continued*)

Chapter	Page
13.3 PRODUCTS PURCHASED FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN FOOD BANKS	226
14. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: IMPORTANCE OF FOOD BANKS	229
14.1 PRODUCTS NEEDED FROM FOOD BANKS	229
14.2 IMPACT OF ELIMINATION OF FOOD BANK.....	233
14.3 AREAS OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE DESIRED	235
APPENDIX A PRECISION OF REPORTED ESTIMATES: SURVEY ERROR AND SAMPLING ERROR	
APPENDIX B SNAP ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	
APPENDIX C SOURCES OF INFORMATION SHOWN IN THE CHARTS AND TABLES IN CHAPTERS 5 THROUGH 14	
APPENDIX D HUNGER IN AMERICA TABLE CROSSWALK FOR NATIONAL REPORT AND LOCAL REPORTS (WHERE APPLICABLE), 2005 TO 2009	

CHARTS

Chart	Page
CHART 2.2.1 SOURCES OF FOOD AND CHANNELS OF FOOD DISTRIBUTION FOR FOOD BANKS.....	10
CHART 3.3.1 AGENCY SURVEY ACTIVITIES	18
CHART 3.4.1 CLIENT SURVEY ACTIVITIES.....	22
CHART 3.5.1 STUDY OVERVIEW	24
CHART 3.5.2 ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS.....	25
CHART 3.5.3 SECOND HARVEST INLAND NORTHWEST - CLARK COUNTY SERVICE AREA	26
CHART 5.1.1 WEIGHTED PERCENTAGES OF CLIENT RESPONDENTS BY TYPE OF INTERVIEW SITE.....	44
CHART 5.3.1 GENDER COMPOSITION OF CLIENTS AT PROGRAM SITES BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	50
CHART 5.3.2 AGE COMPOSITION OF ALL MEMBERS OF CLIENT HOUSEHOLDS BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	53
CHART 5.6.1 RACIAL AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND BY PROGRAM TYPE	58
CHART 5.7.1 HOUSEHOLDS WITH AT LEAST ONE WORKING ADULT BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	60
CHART 5.7.2 EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ALL ADULTS IN CLIENT HOUSEHOLDS BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	63
CHART 5.8.2.1 HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR PREVIOUS MONTH AS PERCENTAGE OF FEDERAL POVERTY LEVEL BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	68
CHART 5.8.3.1 MAIN SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR PREVIOUS MONTH AMONG ALL CLIENTS.....	71
CHART 5.8.3.2 ALL SOURCES OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR PREVIOUS MONTH AMONG ALL CLIENTS.....	73
CHART 5.8.4.1 HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 2008 AS PERCENTAGE OF FEDERAL POVERTY LEVEL BY PROGRAM TYPE	76

CHARTS (*continued*)

Chart	Page
CHART 5.9.1.1 HOUSING BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	83
CHART 5.9.2.1 HOUSEHOLD RESOURCES BY PROGRAM TYPE	88
CHART 6.1.1.1 FOOD INSECURITY AMONG ALL CLIENT HOUSEHOLDS.....	93
CHART 6.1.1.1A FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN YOUNGER THAN AGE 18.....	93
CHART 6.1.1.1B FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS WITH SENIORS AGE 65 OR OLDER.....	94
CHART 6.4.1A INDICATOR OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLD WITH CHILDREN: ANSWERED 'OFTEN' OR 'SOMETIMES' TO 'CHILDREN WERE NOT EATING ENOUGH' BY PROGRAM TYPE ...	120
CHART 6.4.1B INDICATOR OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLD WITH CHILDREN: HOUSEHOLDS WHERE CHILDREN EVER SKIPPED MEALS BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	120
CHART 6.4.1C INDICATOR OF HUNGER AMONG HOUSEHOLD WITH CHILDREN: HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN WHO WERE EVER HUNGRY BY PROGRAM TYPE	121
CHART 7.1.1 USE OF SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BY PROGRAM TYPE	136
CHART 7.2.1 REASONS WHY CLIENT HOUSEHOLDS NEVER APPLIED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	143
CHART 7.3.1 REASONS WHY CLIENT HOUSEHOLDS ARE NOT RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	147
CHART 8.1.1 HOUSEHOLDS WITH AT LEAST ONE MEMBER REPORTED TO BE IN POOR HEALTH BY PROGRAM TYPE	161
CHART 8.2.1 HEALTH INSURANCE AMONG ALL CLIENTS.....	164
CHART 9.2.1 SATISFACTION WITH FOOD PROVIDED BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	171
CHART 9.3.1 WHAT CLIENTS WOULD DO WITHOUT FOOD ASSISTANCE FROM THE AGENCY ALL CLIENTS.....	173

CHARTS (*continued*)

Chart	Page
CHART 10.1.1 PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATING PROGRAMS BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	177
CHART 10.6.1 TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM BY PROGRAM TYPE	188
CHART 12.1.1 PROGRAMS THAT FACE AT LEAST ONE PROBLEM THREATENING THEIR CONTINUED OPERATION BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	202
CHART 12.1.1P NATURE OF PROBLEMS THAT THREATEN CONTINUED OPERATION AMONG PANTRY PROGRAMS	203
CHART 12.2.1 FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES BY PROGRAM TYPE	207
CHART 12.3.1P REASONS FOR TURNING AWAY CLIENTS AMONG PANTRY PROGRAMS.....	213
CHART 12.4.1 AVERAGE AND MEDIAN NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL MEAL EQUIVALENTS NEEDED BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	216
CHART 13.2.1 MEDIAN NUMBER OF PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEERS DURING PREVIOUS WEEK BY PROGRAM TYPE	225
CHART 14.1.1P PRODUCTS NEEDED FROM FOOD BANKS AMONG PANTRY PROGRAMS.....	231
CHART 14.1.1K PRODUCTS NEEDED FROM FOOD BANKS AMONG KITCHEN PROGRAMS.....	231
CHART 14.1.1S PRODUCTS NEEDED FROM FOOD BANKS AMONG SHELTER PROGRAMS.....	232
CHART 14.2.1 IMPACT OF ELIMINATION OF FOOD BANK BY PROGRAM TYPE..	234
CHART 14.3.1P AREAS OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED AMONG PANTRY PROGRAMS.....	236
CHART 14.3.1K AREAS OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED AMONG KITCHEN PROGRAMS	237
CHART 14.3.1S AREAS OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED AMONG SHELTER PROGRAMS	237

TABLES

Table	Page
TABLE 5.1.1	NUMBER OF CLIENT RESPONDENTS 43
TABLE 5.2.1	SUMMARY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF CLIENTS 45
TABLE 5.3.1	AGE, GENDER, AND CITIZENSHIP COMPOSITION AMONG ADULT CLIENTS..... 48
TABLE 5.3.2	AGE, GENDER, AND CITIZENSHIP COMPOSITION 51
TABLE 5.4.1	MARITAL STATUS..... 54
TABLE 5.5.1	HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL ATTAINED..... 55
TABLE 5.6.1	RACIAL AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND..... 57
TABLE 5.7.1	EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD..... 59
TABLE 5.7.2	DETAILED EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD... 61
TABLE 5.8.1.1	THE 2009 FEDERAL POVERTY LEVEL—MONTHLY INCOME 64
TABLE 5.8.2.1	HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR THE PREVIOUS MONTH..... 65
TABLE 5.8.3.1	MAIN SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR THE PREVIOUS MONTH 69
TABLE 5.8.3.2	ALL SOURCES OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR PREVIOUS MONTH 72
TABLE 5.8.4.1	HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR 2008 74
TABLE 5.8.5.1	INCOME IN 2008, BY EDUCATION 77
TABLE 5.8.6.1	INCOME IN 2008, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN 79
TABLE 5.9.1.1	HOUSING STATUS..... 81
TABLE 5.9.1.2	INCOME IN 2008, BY HOUSING STATUS 84
TABLE 5.9.1.3	INCOME IN 2008, BY HOME OWNERSHIP 85
TABLE 5.9.2.1	HOUSEHOLD RESOURCES 87
TABLE 6.1.1.1	HOUSEHOLD FOOD INSECURITY 91
TABLE 6.1.1.2	FOOD INSECURITY, BY PRESENCE OF CHILDREN 95

TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
TABLE 6.1.1.3 FOOD INSECURITY, BY PRESENCE OF YOUNG CHILDREN	96
TABLE 6.1.1.4 FOOD INSECURITY, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN....	97
TABLE 6.1.2.1 FOOD INSECURITY, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION.....	100
TABLE 6.1.3.1 FOOD INSECURITY, BY INCOME IN 2008.....	103
TABLE 6.1.3.2 INCOME IN 2008, BY FOOD SECURITY STATUS.....	104
TABLE 6.1.4.1 FOOD INSECURITY, BY HEALTH STATUS.....	106
TABLE 6.1.5.1 FOOD INSECURITY, BY CITIZENSHIP STATUS	107
TABLE 6.1.5.2 FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS CONTAINING AT LEAST ONE NONCITIZEN, BY PRESENCE OF YOUNG CHILDREN.....	108
TABLE 6.2.1 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY IN HOUSEHOLDS	109
TABLE 6.2.2 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY IN HOUSEHOLDS, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFIT RECEIPT.....	111
TABLE 6.3.1 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG ADULTS	113
TABLE 6.3.2 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG ADULTS, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFIT RECEIPT.....	115
TABLE 6.4.1 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN	118
TABLE 6.4.2 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFIT RECEIPT	122
TABLE 6.5.1 CHOICE BETWEEN FOOD AND NECESSITIES.....	124
TABLE 6.5.2 HOUSEHOLD TRADE-OFFS, BY FOOD SECURITY STATUS	126
TABLE 6.5.3 HOUSEHOLD TRADE-OFFS, BY HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE	129

TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
TABLE 7.1.1 USE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.....	133
TABLE 7.1.2 USE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN	137
TABLE 7.2.1 REASONS WHY CLIENTS NEVER APPLIED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS	140
TABLE 7.2.2 REASONS WHY CLIENTS NEVER APPLIED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN.....	144
TABLE 7.3.1 REASONS WHY CLIENTS OR THEIR HOUSEHOLDS ARE NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, FOR THOSE WHO HAVE APPLIED	146
TABLE 7.3.2 REASONS THAT RESPONDENTS OR THEIR HOUSEHOLDS DO NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, FOR THOSE WHO HAVE APPLIED, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN.....	148
TABLE 7.3.3 REPORTED INCOME LEVELS OF CLIENTS WHO INDICATED INELIGIBLE INCOME AS A REASON FOR NOT RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS	150
TABLE 7.3.4 REPORTED INCOME LEVELS OF CLIENTS WHO INDICATED INELIGIBLE INCOME AS A REASON FOR NOT RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, BY ELDERLY AND CHILD STATUS	151
TABLE 7.4.1 USE OF OTHER PROGRAMS	152
TABLE 7.4.2 NONPARTICIPATION IN THE SUMMER FOOD PROGRAM	153
TABLE 7.5.1 GENERAL ASSISTANCE, WELFARE, AND TANF IN THE PREVIOUS TWO YEARS	155
TABLE 7.6.1 GROCERY SHOPPING PATTERNS	156
TABLE 8.1.1 HEALTH STATUS	159

TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
TABLE 8.2.1 HEALTH INSURANCE AND ACCESS TO MEDICAL CARE	162
TABLE 8.2.2 INCOME IN 2008, BY MEDICAID PARTICIPATION STATUS	165
TABLE 8.2.3 INCOME IN 2008, BY UNINSURED STATUS	166
TABLE 9.1.1 NUMBER OF DIFFERENT PANTRIES OR KITCHENS USED	167
TABLE 9.2.1 SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES AT FOOD PROGRAMS	169
TABLE 9.3.1 WHAT CLIENTS WOULD DO WITHOUT FOOD ASSISTANCE FROM THE AGENCY	172
TABLE 10.1.1 PROGRAMS REPORTED ON BY PARTICIPATING AGENCIES, BY PROGRAM TYPE	176
TABLE 10.2.1 NUMBER OF PROGRAMS OPERATED BY AGENCIES.....	178
TABLE 10.3.1 AGENCIES OPERATING VARIOUS TYPES OF PROGRAMS	179
TABLE 10.4.1 LENGTH OF PROGRAM OPERATION	180
TABLE 10.5.1 OTHER SERVICES OR FACILITIES AGENCIES OR PROGRAMS PROVIDE IN ADDITION TO FOOD DISTRIBUTION, BY PROGRAM TYPE	182
TABLE 10.5.2 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL SERVICES, BY PROGRAM TYPE.....	184
TABLE 10.5.3 OTHER FACILITIES AGENCIES PROVIDE IN ADDITION TO FOOD DISTRIBUTION, BY PROGRAM TYPE	185
TABLE 10.6.1 TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM.....	187
TABLE 10.7.1 PROGRAMS SERVING SELECTED TYPES OF CLIENTS	189
TABLE 10.8.1 AGENCY ESTIMATES OF CHANGE IN NUMBER OF CLIENTS FROM 2006 TO 2009	191
TABLE 10.9.1 SEASONALITY OF CLIENT MIX	192
TABLE 11.1.1 NUMBER OF BOXES OR BAGS DISTRIBUTED IN A TYPICAL WEEK	195
TABLE 11.2.1 AMOUNT OF FOOD SERVED ON THE DAY THE PROGRAM WAS LAST OPEN	197

TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
TABLE 11.2.2 AMOUNT OF FOOD SERVED ON THE DAY THE PROGRAM WAS LAST OPEN, BY TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM.....	199
TABLE 12.1.1 STABILITY OF EXISTING FOOD PROGRAMS	201
TABLE 12.1.2 STABILITY OF EXISTING FOOD PROGRAMS, BY TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM.....	204
TABLE 12.2.1 FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES	206
TABLE 12.2.2 FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES, BY TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM.....	208
TABLE 12.3.1 PROGRAMS THAT TURNED AWAY CLIENTS	211
TABLE 12.3.2 MOST FREQUENT REASONS THE PROGRAM TURNED AWAY CLIENTS	214
TABLE 12.4.1 ADDITIONAL FOOD RESOURCES NEEDED PER WEEK	215
TABLE 13.1.1 SOURCES OF FOOD DISTRIBUTED BY PROGRAMS	217
TABLE 13.1.2 PERCENTAGE OF FOOD RECEIVED BY PROGRAMS FROM FOOD BANK, BY TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM..	219
TABLE 13.1.3 PERCENTAGE OF FOOD RECEIVED BY PROGRAMS FROM FOOD BANK, BY FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES.....	221
TABLE 13.2.1 STAFF AND VOLUNTEER RESOURCES DURING PREVIOUS WEEK	223
TABLE 13.3.1 PRODUCTS PURCHASED FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN FOOD BANK	226
TABLE 14.1.1 PRODUCTS NEEDED FROM FOOD BANKS	229
TABLE 14.2.1 IMPACT OF ELIMINATION OF FOOD BANK	233
TABLE 14.3.1 AREAS OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE DESIRED.....	235

TABLES (*continued*)

Table

Page

1. HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS

This report presents information on the clients and agencies served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The information is drawn from a national study, Hunger in America 2010, conducted in 2009 for Feeding America (FA) (formerly America's Second Harvest), the nation's largest organization of emergency food providers. The national study is based on completed in-person interviews with more than 62,000 clients served by the FA national network, as well as on completed questionnaires from more than 37,000 FA agencies. The study summarized below focuses on emergency food providers and their clients who are supplied with food by food banks in the FA network. Emergency food programs are defined to include food pantries, soup kitchens, and emergency shelters serving short-term residents. It should be recognized that many other types of providers served by food banks are, for the most part, *not* described in this study, including such programs as Congregate Meals for seniors, day care facilities, and after school programs.

Key findings are summarized below:

HOW MANY CLIENTS RECEIVE EMERGENCY FOOD FROM SECOND HARVEST INLAND NORTHWEST - CLARK COUNTY?

- The FA system served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County provides emergency food for an estimated 53,800 different people annually.
- About 9,900 different people receive emergency food assistance in any given week.

WHO RECEIVES EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE?

FA agencies served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County provide food for a broad cross-section of households. Key characteristics include:

- 45% of the members of households served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County are children under 18 years old (Table 5.3.2).
- 12% of the members of households are children age 0 to 5 years (Table 5.3.2).
- 3% of the members of households are elderly (Table 5.3.2).
- About 61% of clients are non-Hispanic white, 6% are non-Hispanic black, 26% are Hispanic, and the rest are from other racial groups (Table 5.6.1).
- 35% of households include at least one employed adult (Table 5.7.1).
- 72% have incomes below the federal poverty level (Table 5.8.2.1) during the previous month.
- 10% are homeless (Table 5.9.1.1).

MANY CLIENTS ARE FOOD INSECURE WITH LOW OR VERY LOW FOOD SECURITY

- Among all client households served by emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County, 83% are food insecure, according to the U.S. government's official food security scale. This includes client households who have low food security and those who have very low food security (Table 6.1.1.1).
- 51% of the clients have very low food security (Table 6.1.1.1).
- Among households with children, 87% are food insecure and 51% are food insecure with very low food security (Table 6.1.1.1).

MANY CLIENTS REPORT HAVING TO CHOOSE BETWEEN FOOD AND OTHER NECESSITIES

- 61% of clients served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County report having to choose between paying for food and paying for utilities or heating fuel (Table 6.5.1).
- 47% had to choose between paying for food and paying their rent or mortgage (Table 6.5.1).
- 41% had to choose between paying for food and paying for medicine or medical care (Table 6.5.1).
- 42% had to choose between paying for food and paying for transportation (Table 6.5.1).

- 47% had to choose between paying for food and paying for gas for a car (Table 6.5.1).

DO CLIENTS ALSO RECEIVE FOOD ASSISTANCE FROM THE GOVERNMENT?

- 57% of client households served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County are receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits (Table 7.1.1); however, it is likely that many more are eligible (Table 7.3.2).
- Among households with children ages 0-3 years, n.p. participate in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) (Table 7.4.1).
- Among households with school-age children, 64% and 58%, respectively, participate in the federal school lunch and school breakfast programs (Table 7.4.1)
- Among households with school-age children, 15% participate in the summer food program (Table 7.4.1).

MANY CLIENTS ARE IN POOR HEALTH

- 41% of households served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County report having at least one household member in poor health (Table 8.1.1)

MOST CLIENTS ARE SATISFIED WITH THE SERVICES THEY RECEIVE FROM THE AGENCIES OF SECOND HARVEST INLAND NORTHWEST - CLARK COUNTY

- 94% of adult clients said they were either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with the amount of food they received from their provider; 95% were satisfied with the quality of the food they received (Table 9.2.1).

HOW LARGE IS SECOND HARVEST INLAND NORTHWEST - CLARK COUNTY?

- Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County included approximately 25 agencies at the administration of this survey, of which 22 have responded to the agency survey. Of the responding agencies, 18 had at least one food pantry, soup kitchen, or shelter.

WHAT KINDS OF ORGANIZATIONS OPERATE EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAMS OF SECOND HARVEST INLAND NORTHWEST - CLARK COUNTY?

- 44% of pantries, 0% of kitchens, and 0% of shelters are run by faith-based agencies affiliated with churches, mosques, synagogues, and other religious organizations (Table 10.6.1).
- At the agency level, 39% of agencies with at least one pantry, kitchen, or shelter and 33% of all agencies including those with other types of programs are faith-based (Table 10.6.1).
- Private nonprofit organizations with no religious affiliation make up a large share of other types of agencies (Table 10.6.1).

HAVE AGENCIES WITH EMERGENCY FOOD PROVIDERS REPORTED CHANGES IN THE NUMBER OF CLIENTS SEEKING SERVICES?

- Among programs that existed in 2006, 100% of pantries, 80% of kitchens, and 25% of shelters of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County reported that there had been an increase since 2006 in the number of clients who come to their emergency food program sites (Table 10.8.1).

WHERE DO AGENCIES WITH EMERGENCY FOOD PROVIDERS OBTAIN THEIR FOOD?

- Food banks are by far the single most important source of food for agencies with emergency food providers, accounting for 81% of the food distributed by pantries, 70% of the food distributed by kitchens, and 36% of the food distributed by shelters (Table 13.1.1).
- Other important sources of food include religious organizations, government, and direct purchases from wholesalers and retailers (Table 13.1.1).
- 88% of pantries, 50% of kitchens, and 25% of shelters receive food from The Emergency Food Assistance Program (Table 13.1.1).

VOLUNTEERS ARE EXTREMELY IMPORTANT IN THE FA NETWORK

- As many as 94% of pantries, 100% of kitchens, and 100% of shelters in Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County use volunteers (Table 13.2.1).
- Many programs rely *entirely* on volunteers; 57% of pantry programs and 50% of kitchens have no paid staff at all (Table 13.2.1).

2. INTRODUCTION

Many individuals and families across the United States confront a diverse and extensive range of barriers in their procurement of adequate food such as financial constraints associated with income and job loss, the high cost of a nutritious diet, and limited access to large stores with more variety and lower prices.¹ These challenges are reflected in statistics found using recent government data that indicate that at least 14.6% of all households in the United States (17.1 million households) were food insecure at least some time during 2008.² Moreover, 5.7% of all U.S. households (6.7 million households) had very low food security characterized by disruptions in eating patterns and reductions in food intake of one or more household members, at least some time during the year from not being able to afford enough food. These disruptions are even more common among households with children younger than 18 (6.6% of all U.S. households, or 2.6 million households, with children under 18 have very low food security). In acknowledging the extent of food insecurity, policy makers, in accordance with Healthy People 2010, have set the public health goal of reducing the rate of food insecurity to 6 percent by the year 2010.³ This task has proved difficult, as the number Americans who are FI remains

¹ Banks, J., M. Marmot, Z. Oldfield, and J.P. Smith. "Disease and Disadvantage in the United States and in England." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, vol. 295, 2006, pp. 2037-2045. Also, Turrell, G., B. Hewitt, C. Patterson, B. Oldenburg, and T. Gould. "Socioeconomic Differences in Food Purchasing Behavior and Suggested Implications for Diet-Related Health Promotion." *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, vol. 15, 2002, pp. 355-64. Powell, M. and Y. Bao. "Food Prices, Access to Food Outlets and Child Weight." *Economics & Human Biology*, vol. 7, no. 1, March 2009, pp.64-72.

² Mark Nord, Margaret Andrews, and Steven Carlson. "Household Food Security in the United States, 2008." U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Economic Research Report No. 83 (ERS-83) November 2009.

³ Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. "Healthy People 2010." Washington, DC: DHHS Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 2000.

stubbornly high. Indeed, the existence of large numbers of people without secure access to adequate nutritious food represents a serious national concern.

While a sizable portion of low-income households and individuals adopt cost-saving practices such as buying products when they are on sale and buying products in bulk, many find it necessary to rely on an extensive network of public and private emergency food providers in order to maintain an adequate food supply. In particular, throughout the United States, food pantries, emergency kitchens, and homeless shelters play a critical role in meeting the nutritional needs of America's low-income population. By providing people who need assistance with food for home preparation (pantries) and with prepared food that can be eaten at the agencies (kitchens and shelters), these organizations help meet the needs of people and households that otherwise, in many instances, would lack sufficient food.

Feeding America (FA), formerly America's Second Harvest, plays a critical role in helping these organizations accomplish their mission. FA, a network comprised of about 80% of all food banks in the United States, supports the emergency food system by obtaining food for the system from national organizations, such as major food companies, and providing technical assistance and other services to the food banks and food rescue organizations. In addition to its role in directly negotiating food donations and in providing, through its affiliates, substantial amounts of food in bulk to emergency food providers, FA plays an extremely important role by increasing awareness of the problems and ramifications of food insecurity and hunger and by developing public and private initiatives to respond to it.

Over the years, FA has periodically studied the workings of its network and the characteristics of the clients the network serves, both to assess the severity of nutrition-related problems of the poor in America and to identify ways of increasing the effectiveness of its

operations. This report presents the results of the fifth comprehensive study sponsored by FA. The study provides detailed information about the programs and agencies that operate under FA network members and the clients the programs serve and provides an important basis for developing public and private responses to food insecurity and hunger at both the national and local levels.

This chapter of the report provides important background for the findings. Subsequent sections are as follows:

- A highlight of the objectives of the study.
- An overview of the FA Network.
- An identification of the groups of organizations involved in conducting the study.
- A description of the layout of the report.

2.1 OBJECTIVES

The Hunger in America 2010 study comprises a national survey of FA emergency food providers and their clients. The study had the following primary objectives:

- To provide annual and weekly estimates at the national and local levels of the number of distinct, unduplicated clients who use the FA network and to provide a comprehensive description of the nature of hunger and food insecurity among them.
- To describe the national and local demographic characteristics, income levels, SNAP benefit utilization, food security status, and service needs of persons and households served by the FA network, and to examine the ability of local agencies to meet the food security needs of their clients.
- To present national and local profiles of the characteristics of the agencies and programs that constitute the FA network in describing the charitable response to hunger throughout the nation.
- To compare national data between the 2005 and 2009 FA research studies and, where possible, to prior studies, to identify trends in emergency food assistance

demands, federal food assistance program use, and changing compositions of the network's agencies and the clients they serve.

The Hunger in America 2010 study was designed to provide a comprehensive profile of the extent and nature of hunger and food insecurity as experienced by people who access FA's national network of charitable feeding agencies. Information was collected on clients' sociodemographic characteristics, including income and employment, benefits from SNAP and other federal or private programs, frequency of visits to emergency feeding sites, and satisfaction with local access to emergency food assistance. Information obtained from provider agencies included size of programs, services provided, sources of food, and adequacy of food supplies.

2.2 OVERVIEW OF THE FEEDING AMERICA NETWORK

The FA network's 205 certified members are regularly monitored by FA staff and food industry professionals to ensure compliance with acceptable food handling, storage, and distribution standards and practices. FA network members distribute food and grocery products to charitable organizations in their specified service areas, as shown in Chart 2.2.1.

Within this system, a number of different types of charitable organizations and programs provide food, directly or indirectly, to needy clients. However, there is no uniform use of terms identifying the essential nature of the organizations. Hunger relief organizations are usually grassroot responses to local needs. As such, they frequently differ throughout the country and use different terminology. For clarity, and consistency with the terminology used in the 2005 study), the terms used in this report are defined as follows:

Food Bank. A food bank is a charitable organization that solicits, receives, inventories, stores, and distributes donated food and grocery products to charitable agencies that directly

serve needy clients. These agencies include churches and qualifying nonprofit [Internal Revenue Code 501(c) (3)] charitable organizations.

Partner Distribution Organization (PDO). PDOs, smaller food banks or larger agencies allied with affiliated food banks, are private, nonprofit, charitable organizations providing important community services. Although some are agencies, all PDOs distribute part of their food to other charities for direct distribution to clients.

Food Rescue Organization (FRO). FROs are nonprofit organizations that obtain mainly prepared and perishable food products from groceries, farmers, warehouses and distributors, as well as from food service organizations, such as restaurants, hospitals, caterers, and cafeterias, and distribute to agencies that serve clients.

Agencies and Food Programs. FA network members distribute food to qualifying charitable agencies, most of which provide food directly to needy clients through food programs. Some agencies operate single-type and single-site food programs, while others operate food programs at multiple sites and sometimes operate several types of food programs.

CHART 2.2.1

SOURCES OF FOOD AND CHANNELS OF FOOD DISTRIBUTION FOR FOOD BANKS



^a Non-Emergency food programs were not sampled for client data collection.

For this research, there are two general categories of food programs that FA network members serve: emergency and nonemergency. Emergency food programs include food pantries, soup kitchens, and shelters. Their clients typically need short-term or emergency assistance.

- ***Emergency Food Pantries*** distribute nonprepared foods and other grocery products to needy clients, who then prepare and use these items where they live. Some food pantries also distribute fresh and frozen food and nutritious prepared food. Food is distributed on a short-term or emergency basis until clients are able to meet their food needs. An agency that picks up boxed food from the food bank to distribute to its clients was included as a food pantry. The study excluded from this category any agency that does not directly distribute food to clients or distributes bulk food only on a basis other than emergency need (such as U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] commodities to all people over age 60). On the other hand, a food bank distributing food directly to clients, including clients referred from another agency, qualified as a food pantry.
- ***Emergency Soup Kitchens*** provide prepared meals served at the kitchen to needy clients who do not reside on the premises. In some instances, kitchens may also provide lighter meals or snacks, such as fresh fruit, vegetables, yogurt and other dairy products, and prepared food such as sandwiches, for clients to take with them when the kitchen is closed. This category includes “Kids Cafe” providers.
- ***Emergency Shelters*** provide shelter and serve one or more meals a day on a short-term basis to low-income clients in need. Shelter may be the primary or secondary purpose of the service. Examples include homeless shelters, shelters with substance abuse programs, and transitional shelters such as those for battered women. The study did not categorize as shelters residential programs that provide services to the same clients for an extended time period. Other excluded programs are mental health/retardation group homes and juvenile probation group homes.

Nonemergency organizations refer to any programs that have a primary purpose other than emergency food distribution but also distribute food. Examples include day care programs, senior congregate-feeding programs, and summer camps.

2.3 GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY

The study was conceived and coordinated by the national offices of FA. Data were collected by 185 FA network members or consortia around the country. FA's research contractor, Mathematica Policy Research provided technical advice throughout the study and implemented the sampling and data analysis activities.

As part of the study review process, oversight and advice were provided by a Technical Advisory Group convened by FA. This group consisted of:

- John Cook, Associate Professor at Boston Medical Center Department of Pediatrics (Chair)
- Beth Osborne Daponte of the United Nation Development Programme's Human Development Report Office (on leave from Yale University)
- Jim Ohls, independent consultant for Feeding America
- Rob Santos, Senior Institute Methodologist at the Urban Institute

As part of the study review process, an additional team of reviewers participated in the review of the national draft report:

- Steve Carlson, Office of Research and Analysis Food and Nutrition Service at the U.S. Department of Agriculture
- Stacy Dean, Director, Food Assistance Policy Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
- Craig Gundersen, Associate Professor at the Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics at the University of Illinois
- Walter Lamia, doctoral candidate at the Colorado State University School of Education

Also, the Member's Advisory Committee (MAC), consisting of selected members of the FA national network, provided valuable input during the research process:

- Marian Guinn, CEO of God's Pantry Food Bank (Committee Chair)

- Jeff Dronkers, Chief Programs & Policy Officer of the Los Angeles Regional Food Bank
- Karen Joyner, Chief Financial Officer of the Food Bank of Southeastern Virginia
- Lori Kapu, Chief Programs Officer of Care and Share Food Bank
- Erin Rockhill, Director of Agency Relations & Program Development of the Second Harvest Food Bank of East Central Indiana
- Carol Tienken, Chief Operating Officer of the Greater Boston Food Bank
- Kristen Yandora, Controller of Forgotten Harvest
- JC Dwyer, State Policy Coordinator of the Texas Food Bank Network

2.4 OVERVIEW OF THE REST OF REPORT

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the methodologies used in the study and shows the proportion of agencies that participated among all eligible agencies in the FA National Network and Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. Chapter 4 makes projections of the numbers of clients served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. Chapters 5 through 9 present detailed findings from the client survey, including information about characteristics of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County clients, their levels of need, and their experiences with the program. Chapters 10 through 14 present findings from the agency survey, including data on characteristics and program operations in Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County service area.

3. METHODS

This study had two components: (1) an agency survey that collected information about the food programs operating in the FA network, and (2) a client survey that collected information from the people using food pantries, emergency kitchens, and shelters in order to provide a better understanding of their needs. Each of the participating food banks helped Mathematica with the development of the sampling frame and with the data collection. Mathematica provided technical assistance with the implementation of the agency and client surveys.

This section provides an overview of the methods used in the survey and analysis work. (Detailed information is contained in the Technical Appendix of the report.) We first discuss two key activities common to both surveys: (1) instrument development, and (2) the training of food bank staff on survey procedures. We then describe each of the two surveys.

3.1 INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

The data collection instruments for this study were based on the questionnaires used in the 2005 study, revised to reflect the 2005 data collection experience and the needs of FA. Mathematica worked closely with FA to revise the questionnaires so that they would provide high-quality data.

3.2 TRAINING

To ensure that each food bank study coordinator had the proper knowledge to administer the surveys, Mathematica conducted three regional, two-day, in-depth training sessions. Most of the training dealt with showing the study coordinators how to prepare local interviewers to conduct the client survey. Each study coordinator also received a training video demonstrating

the client interview process and a manual containing sample materials and an outline of the FA network members' responsibilities.

3.3 AGENCY SURVEY

Mathematica developed the sampling frame for the agency survey by first obtaining, from participating FA network members, lists of all active agencies each member served and then entering the names into a database. The agency survey sample consisted of a census of the agencies provided by the participating members.

After entering the data, Mathematica staff printed bar-coded mailing labels to identify the agencies and their addresses and then shipped the proper number of questionnaires, labels, and mailing envelopes to each participating member. Some members mailed advance letters informing agencies of the planned survey. Study coordinators were instructed, at the training and in the manual, how to assemble and mail the questionnaires. Each envelope included a personalized cover letter.

Agencies also had the option to complete the agency survey online. In letters mailed to their member agencies, food banks provided the web address and log-in information that each agency could use to complete the questionnaire online. In addition, those agencies for which Mathematica had valid e-mail addresses were e-mailed an invitation to participate. Reminder e-mails were sent every two weeks during the early part of the field period and weekly toward the end of the February to June 2009 field period to agencies that had not submitted a questionnaire.

The cover letter, as well as the instructions on the hardcopy questionnaire, directed the agency to complete the questionnaire and mail it back to Mathematica. In most instances, agencies did so, but some members collected the instruments from their agencies and mailed them to Mathematica in bulk. When Mathematica received a questionnaire, staff logged it into a

database by scanning the bar code on the mailing label. Each Monday morning, Mathematica sent an e-mail to the members listing all the questionnaires received the previous week. These e-mails served as the basis for the mailing of reminder postcards to those agencies that did not return the questionnaire within two weeks of the initial mailing, and a second mailing, this time of questionnaires, to agencies that did not return the first one within two weeks after the mailing of reminder postcards. The weekly e-mails also helped the member study coordinators schedule reminder calls to agencies that did not return the questionnaire within three weeks after the second mailing. Occasionally, in areas where response to the mailings of questionnaires was particularly low, member coordinators completed the questionnaires with nonresponding agencies over the phone. Members were also asked to apprise Mathematica of agencies that no longer provided food services so that they could be identified as ineligible in the database.

After Mathematica received, logged into the database, and reviewed the questionnaires, they were shipped to a subcontractor for data capture and imaging. The subcontractor optically scanned all questionnaires and produced data files and CD-ROMs with images of each completed questionnaire for Mathematica. Chart 3.3.1 summarizes the sequence of activities of the agency survey.

CHART 3.3.1

AGENCY SURVEY ACTIVITIES



3.4 CLIENT SURVEY

Preparation for the client survey began with the selection of the FA providers where interviewing was to take place. As previous Hunger in America surveys had done, the client survey in the 2010 study focused on obtaining data on emergency food providers in the FA system and on the people those providers serve. The three types of providers whose clients were included in the 2009 survey (and previous Hunger in America surveys) were food pantries, emergency kitchens, and shelters. Many food banks also provide food to *other types* of agencies, such as those serving congregate meals to seniors and agencies operating day care centers or after-school programs. These other types of agencies perform important roles, but they were defined to be outside the purview of the study because they do not focus on supplying *emergency* food to low-income clients.

At the outset of the 2010 study, we asked the FA food banks that chose to participate to provide Mathematica with lists of all the agencies they served, indicating whether each agency was involved in emergency food provision and, if so, what type of agency it was (pantry, kitchen, shelter, or multitype). Mathematica sampling statisticians then drew initial samples of the agencies where interviews were to take place. These selections were made with probabilities proportional to a measure of size based on reported poundage distributions as the measure of size; that is, large agencies had greater probabilities of selection.

After the initial sampling, Mathematica asked the food banks to provide detailed information for the providers or programs in the sample of agencies. The information sought included when they were open and the average number of clients they served per day. For small, medium, and large food banks (as classified by FA), the sample of agencies for this detailed information was approximately 57, 76, and 95, respectively. Mathematica then used the detailed

information from the sample of agencies to form three pools of providers and drew samples of providers for the client interviewing. At this time, we also selected a reserve sample to account for possible refusal or ineligibility of a provider selected in the primary sample.

For each sampled provider or program, Mathematica selected a specific day and time when the interviewing was to occur, based on the detailed information the food bank had sent to Mathematica. We also provided a range of acceptable dates and times if our selection was not workable for the data collectors. The food banks were responsible for sending staff or volunteers to each selected program at the specified date and time to conduct the interviews. The data collectors were to use (1) the client selection forms developed by Mathematica and approved by FA, and (2) a questionnaire that Mathematica and FA had designed jointly. Clients at the facilities were selected for the interviews through locally implemented randomization procedures designed by Mathematica.⁴ In total, more than 62,000 clients were interviewed for the national study. Mathematica had another firm (a subcontractor) optically scan the completed questionnaires into an electronic database, and the resulting data files provided the basis for the client analysis.

During the fielding, we used randomly selected site replacements only when an agency, provider, or program refused to participate in the client interview effort or if, after conferring with the food bank and agency, we determined the provider to be ineligible for the study. In cases where food banks did not have reserve sample, we drew a supplemental first-stage sample and requested additional information or assigned an additional visit to a program among the programs already sampled. In some instances, we discovered while obtaining additional

⁴ These procedures involve enumerating the client being served at the time of data collection (for example, by when they came to the facility or their place in a line), then taking a “1 in n” sample with a random starting point.

information that an agency (or provider) was no longer operating or did not run a pantry, kitchen, or shelter. In such instances, we dropped the agency (or provider) from the sample.

Mathematica prepared bar-coded labels with identification numbers for the client questionnaires. We also developed and printed, for use by interviewers, client selection forms designed to allow the interviewer to randomly select program participants and to enumerate the number of completed interviews, refusals, and ineligible sample members during on-site data collection. We shipped these materials and client questionnaires to food banks for distribution to the individual data collectors.

After data collection at a provider was completed, the food bank study coordinators shipped questionnaires and client selection forms back to Mathematica. Mathematica staff then logged each questionnaire into a database by scanning the bar-coded label on the cover page. As with the agency survey, each Monday morning Mathematica sent an e-mail to the members listing the agencies where client questionnaires were completed the previous week. The e-mails allowed the member study coordinators to monitor their progress in completing the client survey portion of the study.

After Mathematica received the questionnaires and Mathematica staff logged them into the database, the questionnaires were shipped to the subcontractor for data capture and imaging. The subcontractor optically scanned the questionnaires and produced data files for Mathematica. As with the agency survey, Mathematica received data files and electronic images of all completed client questionnaires on CD-ROMs. Chart 3.4.1 summarizes the sequence of activities in the client survey.

CHART 3.4.1

CLIENT SURVEY ACTIVITIES



3.5 RESPONSE RATES

As Chart 3.5.1 shows, of the FA national network of 205 members, 185 member food banks covering all or part of 47 states and the District of Columbia participated in the agency survey. Of those members, 181 completed data collection for the client survey.

Client Survey. A total of 181 individual members contacted 12,700 agencies to gain access for on-site client data collection. Of those agencies, 12,554 provided detailed information about their programs and 6,454 were sampled for their program sites and participated in client data collection.

FA network members' staff and volunteers sampled 82,301 clients at the eligible agencies; of those 1,557 were determined to be ineligible for age or other reasons. Client interviews were completed with 62,143, or 77.0%, of the eligible respondents.⁵

Agency Survey. A total of 185 participating FA network members sent out questionnaires to 50,471 eligible agencies.⁶ Mathematica received completed questionnaires from 37,098 (73.5%) agencies.

FA Research Involvement. Chart 3.5.2 shows an overview of the process Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County followed for this study. It also identifies the completed numbers of responses from the client interviews and the agency survey, by program type. For the service area of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County, see Chart 3.5.3.

⁵ Interviews were conducted only with respondents age 18 or older.

⁶ Some additional questionnaires were mailed out to agencies who were later found to be no longer operating or to be otherwise ineligible.

CHART 3.5.1
STUDY OVERVIEW



^a This includes Puerto Rico.

^b Client survey conducted in 47 states and Washington, DC.

CHART 3.5.2

ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS





CHART 3.5.3

SECOND HARVEST INLAND NORTHWEST - CLARK COUNTY SERVICE AREA



3.6 ANALYSIS METHODS

Most of the findings presented in this report are based on tabulations of the survey data. In this section, we describe the methods used in this work.

3.6.1 Tables

In the descriptive tabulations of clients presented in chapters 5 through 9, the percentage figures in the tables are based on the total weighted number of usable responses to the client survey, unless specified otherwise. Responses are weighted to represent clients or households of all emergency food programs. In general, weights are based on the inverse probabilities of selection in the sampling and also account for survey nonresponse.⁷ Weights were scaled so that the final weights represent a month-level count of different clients, as derived in Chapter 4 of the national report.⁸

Similarly, all tables containing information obtained from the agency survey, as presented in chapters 10 through 14, are based on the weighted total number of usable responses to the agency survey, unless specified otherwise. The descriptive tabulations in these chapters represent all FA emergency food programs. The weights, calculated based on the sampling frame, also account for survey nonresponse.

Percentage distributions in the client tables are presented by the type of the programs where clients were interviewed (pantries, kitchens, or shelters). When appropriate, the percentage distribution for “all clients” is shown in the last column. Most tabulations of the agency data are presented by the type of programs operated by the agencies.

⁷ To reduce variances in the analysis, we truncated weights with extremely large values. However, to keep the sum of weights unchanged, we then adjusted the weights by an adjustment factor, which is the ratio of the sum of the original weights to the sum of the truncated weights.

⁸ Originally, we computed weights to make the sample representative at the weekly level. We later converted them to a monthly scale to take into account the fact that, compared with kitchen and shelter users, most pantry users do not visit the program in any given week.

The percentages in the tables are rounded to one decimal place and are based only on the valid responses. They exclude missing, “don’t know,” refusal, and other responses deemed incomplete for the question.

The sample sizes presented at the bottom of single-panel tables (or at the bottom of each panel of multipanel tables) reflect the total number of responses to the question (unweighted). Where the question relates to a subset of the respondents, the appropriate sample size is presented. In general, these sample sizes include missing responses, as well as “don’t know” and refusal responses. We report the percentages of item nonresponse in notes to each table.

The main reason for including only valid responses is to present appropriately the weighted percentage distribution among the main response categories of interest. Our preliminary analysis of item nonresponse revealed little evidence of any systematic biases, and excluding missing data also has the advantage of being consistent with the convention used for previous studies commissioned by FA.

Some tables also present the average (mean) or the median values associated with the variable of interest. The average, a measure of central tendency for continuous variables, is calculated as the weighted sum of all valid values in a distribution, divided by the weighted number of valid responses. The median is another measure of central tendency. It is the value that exactly divides an ordered frequency distribution into equal halves. Therefore, 50% of the weighted number of valid responses have values smaller than the median, and the other 50% have values larger. The median is suitable only for describing central tendency in distributions where the categories of the variable can be ordered, as from lowest to highest.

3.6.2 Other Methodological Considerations

Certain other conventions should be noted in interpreting the findings of the study and how they are presented. Below we discuss the distinction between clients and respondents and describe the structure of reports available from the project.

Clients Versus Respondents. *Clients* are defined differently by program type. The kitchen and shelter programs are viewed as serving only those who are present at the program site. (Thus, in general for these providers, the survey respondents are representative of all clients.)⁹ However, pantry programs are regarded as serving all members of respondents' households.

At the kitchen and shelter providers, the sampling unit was the individual. That is, the interviewers were instructed to treat members of a single household as separate respondents if they were selected by our random sampling process and met other eligibility criteria (such as being at least 18 years of age). At the pantry programs, on the other hand, the sampling unit was the household, and only one interview was completed for each randomly selected household, even when two or more members of the household were present at the program.

Ideally, the survey would have obtained all relevant information about every member of the household, especially among pantry users. However, so as not to overburden respondents, the survey was designed to acquire information about at most 10 members of the household, including the respondent. Also, this series of questions was limited to a set of variables of interest, such as sex, age, relationship to the respondent, citizenship, and employment status.

⁹ One exception was children at the kitchens and shelters. They were clients, but they were not respondents, because only clients age 18 or older were interviewed for this study. However, the children were taken into account in estimating the total number of clients.

Because households with more than 10 members are uncommon, we do not believe that this has significantly affected our estimates.

National Versus Local Reports. Hunger in America 2010 has produced a set of reports to serve both national and local interests and to be useful to a wide range of audiences with varying needs. This national report consists of information gathered through 181 participating members for the client survey and 185 members for the agency survey. In addition, in most cases, a local report was generated containing information on clients and agencies served by a particular member. There are roughly 185 member-level local reports. In addition, state-level reports were produced when all FA network members in a particular state participated in this study. About forty-one states achieved full participation of their members.

In addition to the comprehensive national and local reports, FA will disseminate *Hunger in America 2010: An Extended Executive Summary*, which contains key findings from the comprehensive national report. A Technical Appendix, which describes in detail the methodologies of the current study, will be available separately for technical audiences.

Tables in the local and national reports are numbered comparably to facilitate comparisons between the local and national findings. Not all tables from the national report are reproduced in the local documents.

Statistical Sampling Variation and Measurement Error. As with all estimates relying on statistical samples, the client survey estimates in this report are subject to “sampling error,” resulting from the fact that they are based on *samples* of clients rather than information about *all* clients. The margins of error due to this factor vary among individual estimates, depending on such factors as sample sizes, the nature of the client characteristics being estimated, and the number of different providers within a food bank at which the client data collection took place.

In addition to the sampling error, error also exists in the estimates from the operational components of the survey (non-sampling error), such as nonresponse, reporting error, and measurement error. While the sampling design and sample sizes can impose some control on the sampling error (and while this error can be quantified), the non-sampling error reflects the degree of success in designing the questionnaire and data collection procedures and in conducting the data collection activities at all stages. Unfortunately, the non-sampling error cannot be quantified. The exact amount of variation (both sampling error and non-sampling error) will be different for different data items, and the relative contribution of sampling error and non-sampling error to the total survey error will also vary by survey estimate.

For most percentage estimates based on the full sample size for a food bank, this sampling variation can lead to “confidence intervals” extending approximately plus or minus 8 percentage points around the estimate. For instance, if a certain client characteristic percentage is estimated to be 60% within a given food bank, and the “margin of error” is 8 percentage points, we can be reasonably certain it is someplace in the range of 52% to 68%. In many instances, particularly when the sample is divided into subgroups, the width of the confidence interval can be greater.

The ranges of precision highlighted above focus only on sampling variation due to statistical sampling and the number of completed interviews. As noted previously, other forms of survey error (the non-sampling error) will increase overall survey error. These other forms of error include

- ***Nonresponse.*** When completed interviews are obtained from only a portion of the clients selected for the survey
- ***Response Error.*** When the client interviewed does not provide an accurate answer to a question because the client either misunderstands the question or chooses not to provide an accurate answer

- **Reporting Error.** When counts or other information used in the sampling and other data collection activities are in error or missing
- **Measurement Error.** When the question in the questionnaire is not worded effectively to obtain the desired information from the client

These forms of error exist in all surveys, but the size of the non-sampling error (relative to the sampling error) depends on the design of the data collection activities and implementation of these by all persons involved. In this survey, most of the interviewers did not have extensive experience in data collection work, and while Mathematica supplied general training guidelines and materials, there was undoubtedly considerable variation between food banks as to how the training was implemented. Inevitably, as in any survey, some interviewers may have read questions incorrectly, clients may have understood questions incorrectly, and even correct answers may sometimes have been incorrectly recorded on the survey instrument. All these factors may have led to “non-sampling error” *that is in addition to the sampling error discussed above.*

Estimating Client Turnover Rates Within the FA System. An important goal of the periodic FA surveys has been to develop *annual* estimates of the number of clients participating in the FA emergency food assistance system. However, it is much more straightforward to estimate the number of clients *at a given point in time* than to estimate the number over a year. This is because the *annual* number depends on turnover in the system. As an example, consider a pantry that serves 100 clients per month. If the *same* clients go to the pantry month after month, then the *annual* number of clients for the pantry will be equal to 100 since there is no turnover across months. If mostly the *same* clients go to the pantry month after month, then the *annual* number of clients for the pantry will be slightly greater than 100 to account for a few clients leaving and others replacing them. If mostly *different* clients come each month, however,

the pantry could serve 1,000 clients, or even more, in a year. Thus, taking into account the amount of client turnover can have major implications for overall client estimates.

Turnover rates are important for the *research objective* of making annual estimates of different clients. They are much less important from an *operational perspective*, however, and most FA providers do not have reliable data on the total number of different clients served in a year. Also complicating annual estimation research is the constraint that, for logistical reasons, the survey can observe the system directly for only a few months.

Because of these factors, the study depends on information obtained during the client interviews to draw inferences about client usage of the system over a 12-month period. Survey recall problems pose formidable challenges to interpreting the data, however, because many clients may not accurately recall and report their past usage patterns for an entire year. Typically, clients are able to supply accurate information about their usage of the emergency food system during a recent period, such as a week (or even perhaps a month), but as the period gets longer, recall usually becomes less reliable. While long recall periods are a problem for many surveys, they may be particularly problematic for the FA client population, because many of them are concentrating on how to meet day-to-day household needs with low resources, rather than thinking about the past year.

As in the 2005 survey, we tried to examine client turnover based on the self-reports of survey respondents about their patterns of using the FA system. The research strategy focuses on the “newcomer rate,” defined as the percentage of clients at a given point in time who have started using FA providers within the past month but had not used the FA system in the previous

12 months. If we can estimate “newcomers” defined in this way for 12 months in a row, the sum yields a measure of all the people who entered the system during the past year.¹⁰

The 2009 survey used a question that was first added to the survey questionnaire in 2005:

P61b Now, thinking about the past year, did you or anyone in your household use a pantry...

- ¹ ☐ Every month, (12 MONTHS)
- ² ☐ Almost every month, (10-11 MONTHS)
- ³ ☐ Most months, (6-9 MONTHS)
- ⁴ ☐ Some months, (4-5 MONTHS)
- ⁵ ☐ Just a few months, (2-3 MONTHS)
- ⁶ ☐ Just this month?
- ^D ☐ DON'T KNOW
- ^R ☐ REFUSED

3.7 REPORTING CONVENTIONS IN FOOD BANK REPORTS

In some instances, there were certain client-based tabular analyses for which fewer than 30 observations were available. (This happened mostly with shelters and, to a lesser extent, kitchens.) In these instances, the relevant tabulations have not been included in the tables, because there are too few client observations for the results to be statistically reliable.¹¹

When client tabulations have been suppressed because of small sample sizes, the entry *n.p.* (“not presented”) is made in the relevant columns of the tables. In these cases, the client

¹⁰ Key to the approach outlined in the text is that a “newcomer” is defined as a person who starts using the FA system *and has not previously used it for at least a year*. Of course, some people may enter and exit the system several times during the year; however, in making *annual unduplicated estimates*, we want to count these people only once a year.

¹¹ On the other hand, when presenting agency findings, we have reported tabulations with fewer than 30 programs, in part because some of the smaller members do not have as many as 30 kitchens or shelters.

observations *are* included in computing the “total” column, which is aggregated across the three types of programs.¹²

In some instances, there may be no observations available at all for a column or cell of a table. In those cases, we have entered *N.A.* (“not available”). In other instances, a survey question is asked only of clients at a specific type of program such as pantries. In these cases, the entry *n.a.* (“not applicable”) is made in the relevant columns of the tables.

¹² Because of a limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports, in some instances a chart corresponding to a table with the n.p. or N.A. conventions may actually have a graphic corresponding to the suppressed column in the table. In those instances, that part of the chart should be ignored.

4. ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF AGENCIES AND CLIENTS

This section presents estimates of the number of clients and agencies in the area served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. These estimates are derived from the sampling and data collection work in the area covered. In assessing these estimates, it is important to remember that the FA system is dynamic and constantly changing. Also, because of various factors detailed later in the chapter, the available estimation methodologies sometimes involve substantial margins of error. For the annual and weekly client counts, we discuss both the estimate and the associated margin of error.

Sections 4.1 and 4.2 present an overview of the estimates. Section 4.3 discusses the limitations of the projections.

4.1 ESTIMATED NUMBER OF AGENCIES

During the preparation for the survey work, FA network members were asked to supply Mathematica with lists of all the member agencies to which they distribute food. Mathematica then carefully reviewed these lists, and to refine them, in some instances performed several stages of interaction with members.

On the basis of the final list of agencies generated by this process, we estimate that Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County served approximately 25 agencies at the time of the survey, of which 22 agencies responded to the agency survey. These responses contained usable information on 16 pantries, 6 kitchens, 5 shelters, and 16 other nonemergency food programs.

4.2 ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CLIENTS

Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County attempted interviews with clients at certain agencies that it serves, determined as a subsample of agencies Mathematica selected using randomizing procedures. Based on the results of this agency-level sampling process and of the random sampling of clients implemented at the sites, Mathematica developed survey weights that make the sample representative of all clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

From these weights we have developed estimates of the numbers of FA clients served within the areas of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. Originally we did the weighting at the weekly level, to make the sample representative of clients served in a given week. We then extrapolated these weekly estimates to cover an annual period, using the same percentage projection factors as those used with the national data, as described in the *Hunger in America 2010 National Report*.

Based on this approach, the estimated number of different clients served per week by FA emergency food providers in the area served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County is 9,900. The estimate of different clients served annually is 53,800. Because these estimates are based on relatively small survey samples and are therefore subject to considerable statistical sampling error, it is important qualify these estimates with a measure of error. The 90-percent confidence interval for the weekly count is 7,800 to 12,100 clients and the 90-percent confidence interval for the annual count is 28,400 to 79,200 clients. Standard statistical analysis indicates that we can be reasonably certain the true values of the weekly and annual counts fall within these ranges. Additional details of how to interpret estimates using ranges based on sampling error are provided in Appendix A.

The weekly estimate is meant to be an estimate of the number of *different* people who use emergency food services supplied by the food bank in a week. Each person is only included once. For instance, if the same person goes to a soup kitchen three times during the week, that person is only counted *once* not three times. For pantry users, all persons in a household are included in the count.

The *annual unduplicated count* is defined similarly to the weekly count. It is an estimate of all of the people served during a year by emergency food providers that are supplied by the food bank. People who use the system multiple times are only counted once. For instance, if a household used a pantry every month for the year, members of that household would only be counted once. In general, the annual count will be much less than 52 times the weekly count, because most people getting food from a provider in a given week are likely to use the system in other weeks as well. On the other hand, the annual count is much larger than the weekly count because there is considerable turnover of people entering and leaving the system.

4.3 BACKGROUND AND LIMITATIONS OF THE ESTIMATES

We used several data sources to derive estimates of the size of the FA system:

- Information from the survey sample frame of providers, which was compiled from records of FA network members
- Information from the sampling and data collection operations concerning the observed numbers of clients served by providers, the providers' days of operation, and similar factors
- Information from the client survey concerning respondents' length and frequency of use of the emergency food system
- Information from FA administrative files concerning the relative sizes of the FA members that participated in the study compared with those that did not participate

Given these rich data sources, several approaches could be taken in the estimation work. In much of the work below, we drew primarily on an approach, rooted in standard statistical estimation theory, whereby we (1) computed the probabilities of various providers and clients being in our survey sample, (2) computed analysis weights based on these probabilities, and (3) estimated the underlying population totals by summing the relevant analysis weights. In some instances, however, we employed alternative approaches to supplement the estimates.

For each food bank, the estimate of *weekly* clients served is derived from the sums of the weekly client weights for the food bank. As described in detail in the National Report for the study, these weekly weights reflect the probabilities of client selection at the multiple sampling stages,¹³ together with adjustments for non-response and similar factors.

For estimates of *annual* unduplicated clients at the food bank level, the basic approach taken was to allocate the national total as estimated in the National Report, among the various food banks. In part, the allocation process was based on the food bank-level weekly estimates derived during the weighting process. In addition, because of the relatively small sample sizes at the food bank level, we used a second variable, the “goal factor” determined by FA to essentially provide more stability and thus anchor the estimates.¹⁴ Specifically, we (1) rescaled the goal factors to place them on a scale comparable to the estimates based on the sums of statistical weights; (2) took the simple average of these two components (sums of weights and rescaled goal factor) to form a composite indicator; and then (3) used that composite index to proportionately allocate the national totals to the individual food banks.

¹³ Including sampling agencies, sampling providers within agencies, and sampling clients within providers.

¹⁴ The goal factor is based on population and poverty data and is designed to be a measure of the relative need for emergency food in each food bank’s service area.

There is unavoidably some uncertainty in the estimates presented. This uncertainty derives from several factors, including:

- ***Reporting Error.*** Some of the interview questions on which our estimates are based were unavoidably somewhat complex. As a result, there is undoubtedly some error caused by respondents not always understanding the questions and not always reporting accurately.
- ***Nonresponse Bias.*** As with any survey, it must be assumed that there is at least some nonresponse error caused by the agencies and clients who did not respond to our surveys being different from those that did.
- ***Seasonality.*** Because of logistical requirements, most of the data were collected during the spring of 2009. It is therefore not possible with this data set to fully examine and correct for fluctuations in providers of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County and clients over the entire year.

5. CLIENTS: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

One of the most important purposes of the evaluation has been to develop a description of the people and households served by the FA National Network. Key findings are presented in this section. Results reported in Chapters 5 through 9 represent all clients served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.


We begin by describing the client sample on which the analysis is based. Section 5.2 then provides an overall profile of clients served by Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. Subsequent sections provide additional details about clients' demographic characteristics, citizenship, education levels, household income levels, and other resources.

5.1 NUMBER OF CLIENT RESPONDENTS

A total of 125 clients were interviewed at selected program sites of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The clients interviewed at the pantry programs (101 clients) account for 80.8% of all client respondents. Those interviewed at the kitchen programs (24 clients) make up 19.2% of the total, and those interviewed at the shelter programs (N.A. clients) account for the remaining 0.0%. See Table 5.1.1, which also shows the percentage distribution after the weights described earlier were applied to each observation.

TABLE 5.1.1
NUMBER OF CLIENT RESPONDENTS

Site of Interview	Client Respondents		
	Number	Unweighted Percentage	Weighted Percentage
Pantry	101	80.8%	89.2%
Kitchen	24	19.2%	10.8%
Shelter	N.A.	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	125	100.0%	100.0%



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

5.2 SUMMARY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Client respondents provided information about various demographic characteristics of themselves and their households. Table 5.2.1 summarizes the demographic profile of the client households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. It also contains statistics about adult clients who visit emergency food programs.

TABLE 5.2.1
SUMMARY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF CLIENTS

	Pantry	Kitchen	Shelter	All
Client Households				
Size of household ^a				
Households with 1 member	23.5%	n.p.	N.A.	25.9%
Households with 2-3 members	28.3%	n.p.	N.A.	27.8%
Households with 4-6 members	35.6%	n.p.	N.A.	35.0%
Households with more than 6 members	12.6%	n.p.	N.A.	11.3%
Average household size	3.6	n.p.	N.A.	3.5
Median household size	3	n.p.	N.A.	3
Households with nonfamily members	1.4%	n.p.	N.A.	1.3%
Households with one or more adults employed	36.6%	n.p.	N.A.	35.4%
Households with single parents	18.4%	n.p.	N.A.	17.4%
Households with single parents among households with children younger than age 18 ^b	31.7%	n.p.	N.A.	31.3%
Elderly and children in household				
Households with children younger than age 18	57.9%	n.p.	N.A.	55.7%
Households with children ages 0-5 years	26.7%	n.p.	N.A.	24.9%
Households with children ages 0-3 years	19.8%	n.p.	N.A.	18.7%
Households with any member 65 years or older	12.2%	n.p.	N.A.	11.3%
Households with grandchildren	5.2%	n.p.	N.A.	4.7%
Households with a respondent who provides basic needs to grandchild, among households with a grandchild	4.6%	n.p.	N.A.	4.2%

	Pantry	Kitchen	Shelter	All
Adult Clients at Program Sites				
Adult Clients at Program Sites				
Male	32.9%	n.p.	N.A.	35.1%
Female	67.1%	n.p.	N.A.	64.9%
U.S. citizens	85.3%	n.p.	N.A.	85.6%
Registered voters ^c	52.9%	n.p.	N.A.	54.2%
Married or living as married	55.0%	n.p.	N.A.	53.4%
High school graduate	75.8%	n.p.	N.A.	75.3%
Currently employed	24.1%	n.p.	N.A.	24.1%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 11a, 12, 81a, and 82 of the client survey.

Notes: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses, except for the percentage of employed clients (See Table 5.7.2). All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

^aFor all programs, responses greater than 24 people in a household were recoded as 24 people. Additional data are available for at most 10 members of each household. See Chapter 3 for details.

^bThe sample size is 60 for the pantry, 7 for the kitchen N.A. for the shelter, and 67 for all.

^cFor registered voters, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 5.0% for pantry clients, 10.9% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 5.7% for all clients.

The upper part of Table 5.2.1 shows the composition of client households. The average household size is 3.5, and 35.4% of the households have an employed adult. In addition:

- 25.9% of the client households are single-person households.
- 11.3% of the client households have more than six members.
- Among client households with children younger than age 18, 31.3% are single-parent households.
- 55.7% of the client households have at least one member younger than age 18.
- 24.9% of the client households have one or more children ages 0 to 5 years.
- 11.3% of the households have at least one member age 65 years or older.

The lower part of Table 5.2.1 shows that 35.1% of the adult clients visiting emergency food programs are men, while 64.9% are women. (Table 5.3.1 contains detailed age, gender, and citizenship information.) Among adults at emergency providers, 85.6% are U.S. citizens, 75.3% are high school graduates, and 24.1% are currently working. These statistics, however, take into account only the client population who come to the program sites. Since the pantries' client base is not limited to the individual members who come to pick up food, but includes all members of such clients' households, it is also of interest to examine similar tabulations based on all individual members of client households. Table 5.3.2 in the next section presents age, gender, and citizenship composition of all members of client households.

5.3 AGE, GENDER, AND CITIZENSHIP COMPOSITION

Clients interviewed were asked to provide information on age, gender, and U.S. citizenship for themselves and for at most nine members of their households. Table 5.3.1 shows the distribution of each variable only among the population represented by clients interviewed at program sites. Table 5.3.2 shows the distribution among all members of client households.

TABLE 5.3.1

AGE, GENDER, AND CITIZENSHIP COMPOSITION AMONG ADULT CLIENTS

	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	Adult Clients at All Program Sites
Age				
18-29	10.5%	n.p.	N.A.	10.5%
30-49	55.5%	n.p.	N.A.	56.0%
50-64	24.8%	n.p.	N.A.	25.0%
65 and over	9.2%	n.p.	N.A.	8.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Gender				
Male	32.9%	n.p.	N.A.	35.1%
Female	67.1%	n.p.	N.A.	64.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
U.S. Citizen				
Yes	85.3%	n.p.	N.A.	85.6%
No	14.7%	n.p.	N.A.	14.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 2, 3, and 5 of the client survey.

Notes: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.


For age, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.0% for all clients.

For gender, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.4% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.0% for all clients.

For citizenship, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.5% for pantry clients, 17.2% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.2% for all clients.

Among the adult clients who come to program sites, 10.5% are ages 18 to 29; 56.0% ages 30 to 49; 25.0% ages 50 to 64; and 8.4% ages 65 and older. In addition:

- Among the adult pantry clients who were represented at the interview sites (not including all members of their households), 10.5% are ages 18 to 29; 55.5% ages 30 to 49; 24.8% ages 50 to 64; and 9.2% ages 65 and older.
- 32.9% of adult pantry clients at program sites are male.
- 85.3% of adult pantry clients at program sites are U.S. citizens.
- Among the adult kitchen clients, n.p. are ages 18 to 29, n.p. ages 30 to 49, n.p. ages 50 to 64, and n.p. ages 65 and older.
- n.p. of adult kitchen clients at program sites are male.
- n.p. of adult kitchen clients at program sites are U.S. citizens.
- Among the adult shelter clients, N.A. are ages 18 to 29, N.A. ages 30 to 49, N.A. ages 50 to 64, and N.A. ages 65 and older.
- N.A. of adult shelter clients at program sites are male.
- N.A. of adult shelter clients at program sites are U.S. citizens.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p" or "N.A". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

TABLE 5.3.2

AGE, GENDER, AND CITIZENSHIP COMPOSITION

	All Members of Household, Pantry	All Members of Household, Kitchen	All Members of Household, Shelter	All Members of Household, All Programs
Age ^a				
0-3	6.7%	3.5%	N.A.	6.4%
4-5	5.3%	3.4%	N.A.	5.1%
6-17	33.9%	33.5%	N.A.	33.8%
18-29	14.0%	16.3%	N.A.	14.1%
30-49	26.2%	31.2%	N.A.	26.6%
50-64	10.7%	10.3%	N.A.	10.6%
65 and over	3.3%	1.8%	N.A.	3.2%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)^b	383	57	N.A.	440
Gender ^a				
Male	44.6%	49.8%	N.A.	45.0%
Female	55.4%	50.2%	N.A.	55.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%
U.S. Citizen ^a				
Yes	87.3%	92.0%	N.A.	87.6%
No	12.7%	8.0%	N.A.	12.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	376	57	N.A.	433

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 2, 3, 5, 6a, and 6b of the client survey.

Notes: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For age, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.1% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.1% for all clients.

For gender, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.9% for all clients.


For citizenship, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.2% for pantry clients, 6.7% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.6% for all clients.

^aData available for at most 10 members of household. See the Technical Appendix volume for details.

^bThe sample sizes for age variables may be larger than those for the other two variables in this table. This is because the client questionnaire had additional questions to identify household members who are younger than age 18 and whether the household has any children between ages 0 and 5.

When we consider all members of client households, 6.4% are ages 0 to 3, 5.1% are ages 4 to 5, 33.8% are ages 6 to 17, 14.1% are ages 18 to 29, 26.6% are ages 30 to 49, 10.6% are ages 50 to 64, and 3.2% are ages 65 and older. Information on age distribution, as well as gender and citizenship distributions, by program type follows:

- Among all members of pantry client households, 11.9% are ages 0 to 5; 33.9% are ages 6 to 17; 14.0% are ages 18 to 29; 26.2% are ages 30 to 49, 10.7% are ages 50 to 64, and 3.3% are ages 65 and older.
- 44.6% of all members of pantry client households are male.
- 87.3% of all members of pantry client households are U.S. citizens.
- Among all members of kitchen client households, 6.9% are ages 0 to 5; 33.5% are ages 6 to 17; 16.3% are ages 18 to 29; 31.2% are ages 30 to 49; 10.3% are ages 50 to 64, and 1.8% are ages 65 and older.
- 49.8% of all members of kitchen client households are male.
- 92.0% of all members of kitchen client households are U.S. citizens.
- Among all members of shelter client households, N.A. are ages 0 and 5; N.A. are ages 6 and 17; N.A. are ages 18 to 29; N.A. are ages 30 to 49; N.A. are ages 50 to 64; and N.A. are ages 65 and older.
- N.A. of all members of shelter client households are male.
- N.A. of all members of shelter client households are U.S. citizens.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

5.4 MARITAL STATUS

Clients were also asked about their marital status. Table 5.4.1 presents the findings.

TABLE 5.4.1
MARITAL STATUS

Clients' Marital Status	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	Adult Clients at All Program Sites
Married	44.7%	n.p.	N.A.	44.1%
Living as married	10.3%	n.p.	N.A.	9.3%
Widowed	6.8%	n.p.	N.A.	8.9%
Divorced	16.9%	n.p.	N.A.	17.9%
Separated	13.0%	n.p.	N.A.	12.0%
Never been married	8.4%	n.p.	N.A.	7.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 9 of the client survey.

Notes: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 7.2% for pantry clients, 21.3% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 8.7% for all clients.

Key findings include:

- Overall, 44.1% of the clients at all program sites are married.
 - The percentage of married clients at pantry programs is 44.7%.
 - The percentage of married clients at kitchen programs is n.p..
 - The percentage of married clients at shelter programs is N.A..
- 9.3% of the clients at all program sites are living as married.
- 8.9% of the clients at all program sites are widowed.
- 12.0% of the clients at all program sites are separated.
- 7.8% of the clients at all program sites have never been married.

5.5 HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL ATTAINED

Clients were asked the highest education level they had attained. Education levels of clients based on their responses are provided in Table 5.5.1.

TABLE 5.5.1
HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL ATTAINED

Clients' Education Level	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	All Adult Clients
Less than high school	24.2%	n.p.	N.A.	24.7%
Completed high school or equivalent degree (but not higher)	35.7%	n.p.	N.A.	37.9%
Completed noncollege business/trade/ technical school	6.6%	n.p.	N.A.	5.9%
Some college/two-year degree	31.0%	n.p.	N.A.	29.2%
Completed college or higher	2.6%	n.p.	N.A.	2.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 10 of the client survey.

Notes: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.6% for pantry clients, 2.3% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.5% for all clients.

As Table 5.5.1 shows, 24.7% of the clients at emergency food programs have not completed high school. The comparable percentage for the entire U.S. adult population is 14.3%.¹⁵ More details follow:

- 37.9% of all clients finished high school but received no further education beyond high school.

¹⁵ *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2009*. Table No. 221.

- 29.2% of all clients have some college education or completed a two-year degree.
- 2.3% of all clients have completed college or beyond.

5.6 RACIAL AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Clients were asked about their racial and ethnic background. Table 5.6.1 summarizes the results.

TABLE 5.6.1
RACIAL AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Clients' Racial ^a and Ethnic Background	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	All Adult Clients
Non-Hispanic White	60.9%	n.p.	N.A.	61.5%
Non-Hispanic Black	5.2%	n.p.	N.A.	6.0%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	6.0%	n.p.	N.A.	5.4%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1.4%	n.p.	N.A.	1.2%
Asian	2.6%	n.p.	N.A.	2.3%
Latino or Hispanic				
Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano	18.1%	n.p.	N.A.	18.2%
Puerto Rican	3.6%	n.p.	N.A.	3.2%
Cuban	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Other Latino or Hispanic	5.0%	n.p.	N.A.	4.8%
SUBTOTAL	26.8%	n.p.	N.A.	26.2%
Other ^b	3.5%	n.p.	N.A.	3.1%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 11, 11a, and 12 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For race, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.7% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.6% for all clients.


For ethnicity, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.0% for all clients.

^aMultiple responses were accepted for races.

^bMost respondents who marked "Other" as their choice did not provide further information. Those who provided an answer sometimes indicated their nationality, but because the number of usable responses was small, recoding of those responses based on this information was not performed.

Racial or ethnic background of the clients at emergency food program sites follows:

- Among the clients who come to all program sites, 61.5% are non-Hispanic white; 6.0% non-Hispanic black; and 5.4% American Indian or Alaskan Native.
- 1.2% are native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and 2.3% are Asian.
- A total of 26.2% of the clients at all program sites indicate they are Spanish, Latino, or of Hispanic descent or origin.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

5.7 EMPLOYMENT OF ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD

Client respondents provided information on their households' current employment status.

Table 5.7.1 and Table 5.7.2 present the findings regarding all adults in the households.¹⁶

TABLE 5.7.1
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD

	All Adult Members of Household, Pantry	All Adult Members of Household, Kitchen	All Adult Members of Household, Shelter	All Adult Members of Household, All Programs
Percentage of employed adults among all adults in client households	23.6%	15.1%	N.A.	22.8%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	217	42	N.A.	259
Percentage of employed adults among adults younger than age 65 in client household ^a	25.1%	14.5%	N.A.	24.1%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	201	38	N.A.	239
Percentage of client households with one or more adults employed	36.6%	n.p.	N.A.	35.4%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 3 and 6 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. Because this table was constructed combining responses to several questions, excluding item nonresponses could have caused confusion.

For all adults in the household, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.2% for pantry clients, 9.2% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 2.9% for all clients.

For adults younger than age 65 in the household, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.4% for pantry clients, 9.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.1% for all clients.


For client households, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.0% for all clients.

^aIncludes only households with at least one adult younger than age 65.

¹⁶ Data are available for at most 10 members of the household. See Technical Appendix volume for details.

Among all adults in client households, 22.8% are employed. When we consider adults younger than age 65, 24.1% are currently working. At the household level, 35.4% have one or more adults employed. Results by program type show:

- 36.6% of the pantry client households have one or more adults currently employed.
- n.p. of the kitchen client households have one or more adults currently employed.
- N.A. of the shelter client households have one or more adults currently employed.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

TABLE 5.7.2

DETAILED EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD

	All Adult Members of Household, Pantry	All Adult Members of Household, Kitchen	All Adult Members of Household, Shelter	All Adult Members of Household, All Programs
Current employment status of all adults in client households ^a				
Full-time	12.1%	0.5%	N.A.	11.1%
Part-time	11.4%	14.6%	N.A.	11.7%
Not employed ^b	76.4%	84.9%	N.A.	77.2%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	217	42	N.A.	259
Current employment status of all adults younger than age 65 in client households ^{a,c}				
Full-time	12.9%	0.6%	N.A.	11.8%
Part-time	11.6%	13.9%	N.A.	11.9%
Not employed ^b	75.4%	85.5%	N.A.	76.4%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	201	38	N.A.	239
Employment status of adult clients interviewed at program sites ^a				
Currently working				
Full-time	14.4%	n.p.	N.A.	12.9%
Part-time	9.6%	n.p.	N.A.	11.2%
Unknown	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	24.1%	n.p.	N.A.	24.1%
Not working				
Never worked	1.1%	n.p.	N.A.	2.0%
Have not worked for				
Less than 3 months	3.2%	n.p.	N.A.	2.9%
3-5 months	6.7%	n.p.	N.A.	6.0%
6-8 months	10.8%	n.p.	N.A.	10.9%
9-11 months	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.6%
1-2 years	15.3%	n.p.	N.A.	15.1%
More than 2 years	35.8%	n.p.	N.A.	34.1%
Unknown	3.0%	n.p.	N.A.	3.0%
Missing	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	74.8%	n.p.	N.A.	72.6%
Unknown	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	1.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

	All Adult Members of Household, Pantry	All Adult Members of Household, Kitchen	All Adult Members of Household, Shelter	All Adult Members of Household, All Programs
Clients with managerial or professional jobs among those who have worked before or are currently working ^d	17.3%	n.p.	N.A.	18.9%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	93	21	N.A.	114
Clients participating in government-sponsored job training or work experience programs among those who have never worked	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	0	N.A.	0

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 3, 6, 12a, 13, 14a, and 15 of the client survey.

NOTE: For all adults with managerial or professional jobs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.8% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.5% for all clients.

For all adults participating in government-sponsored job training missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.0% for all clients.

^aThe percentages were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. Because this panel of the table was constructed combining responses to several questions, excluding item nonresponses could have caused confusion. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

^bIncludes both individuals who are unemployed and out of the labor force.


^cIncludes only households with at least one adult younger than age 65.

^dThis was assessed by the interviewer given the respondent's description of the tasks performed at the respondent's current or last job.

As shown in Table 5.7.2, when we consider the employment status of all adults in client households, 11.1% are employed full-time, 11.7% are employed part-time, and 77.2% are currently unemployed. Details of the employment status of adult clients who come to program sites follow:

- Overall, 12.9% of the adult clients at program sites are currently employed full-time; 11.2% employed part-time.

- 2.9% of the clients have recently lost their job, having been unemployed for three months or less.
- 15.1% of all clients have been unemployed for one to two years.
- 34.1% of all clients have not worked for more than two years.
- Among those who have worked before or are currently working, 18.9% either had or currently have managerial or professional jobs.
- 2.0% of the clients had never worked; of these, n.p. are participating in government-sponsored job training or work experience programs.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

5.8 HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Lack of sufficient income usually plays a major role in forcing a person or a family to seek assistance from an emergency food provider. In this section, we examine patterns of income receipt, for both monthly and annual income.

5.8.1 Federal Poverty Level

The U.S. government periodically establishes poverty guidelines to provide an indication of the levels of income below which households of various sizes would be considered impoverished. In parts of the analysis in this section, it will be useful to refer to these guidelines as a tool in understanding the meaning of various income levels. For reference, Table 5.8.1.1 presents 100% of these federal poverty levels.

TABLE 5.8.1.1
THE 2009 FEDERAL POVERTY LEVEL—MONTHLY INCOME

Household Size	48 Contiguous States and District of Columbia	Alaska	Hawaii
1	\$903	\$1,128	\$1,038
2	\$1,214	\$1,518	\$1,397
3	\$1,526	\$1,908	\$1,755
4	\$1,838	\$2,298	\$2,113
5	\$2,149	\$2,688	\$2,472
6	\$2,461	\$3,078	\$2,830
7	\$2,773	\$3,468	\$3,188
8	\$3,084	\$3,858	\$3,547
Each additional member	+\$312	+\$390	+\$358

SOURCE: Federal Register, Vol. 74, No. 13, January 23, 2009, pp. 4199-4201.

NOTE: The 2009 federal poverty guidelines (also known as the federal poverty level) reflect price changes through calendar year 2008; accordingly they are approximately equal to the Census Bureau poverty thresholds for calendar year 2008.

5.8.2 Household Income for the Previous Month

Clients were asked to report their total household income for the previous month or to choose from a set of predefined income brackets. The results are in Table 5.8.2.1.

TABLE 5.8.2.1

HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR THE PREVIOUS MONTH

Income for the Previous Month	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Total monthly income				
No income	10.2%	n.p.	N.A.	10.3%
\$1-\$499	10.4%	n.p.	N.A.	9.4%
\$500-\$999	25.2%	n.p.	N.A.	22.7%
\$1,000-\$1,499	26.2%	n.p.	N.A.	28.4%
\$1,500-\$1,999	5.1%	n.p.	N.A.	4.7%
\$2,000-\$2,499	4.2%	n.p.	N.A.	4.8%
\$2,500-\$2,999	6.0%	n.p.	N.A.	5.4%
\$3,000 or more	5.7%	n.p.	N.A.	6.4%
Unknown	6.9%	n.p.	N.A.	8.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Average monthly income among valid responses (in dollars) ^a	1,130	n.p.	N.A.	1,170
Median monthly income among valid responses (in dollars)	1,000	n.p.	N.A.	1,020
Income as a percentage of the federal poverty level ^{b c}				
0% (no income)	10.2%	n.p.	N.A.	10.3%
1%-50%	28.3%	n.p.	N.A.	25.3%
51%-75%	26.4%	n.p.	N.A.	26.7%
76%-100%	8.9%	n.p.	N.A.	9.6%
101%-130%	5.6%	n.p.	N.A.	5.2%
131%-150%	2.7%	n.p.	N.A.	3.4%
151%-185%	8.7%	n.p.	N.A.	8.1%
186% or higher	2.3%	n.p.	N.A.	3.4%
Unknown	6.9%	n.p.	N.A.	8.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Average monthly income as a percentage of the poverty level among valid responses	68.1%	n.p.	N.A.	72.6%
Median monthly income as a percentage of the poverty level among valid responses	64.8%	n.p.	N.A.	65.1%

Income for the Previous Month	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 27 and 27a of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table and across related tables, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

For total monthly income, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.9% for pantry clients, n.p. for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 8.0% for all clients. The missing rates we report here were obtained after we cross-imputed missing responses for monthly and yearly income variables.

For income as percentage of federal poverty level, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.9% for pantry clients, n.p. for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 8.0% for all clients.

^aFor the calculation of the average and the median, responses given as a range were recoded to be the midpoint of the range.

^bThe percentages in this panel may not be equal to those in the corresponding row of the upper panel of this table because the two panels of data may have different item nonresponse rates. The calculation in the lower panel required information about household size as well as household income.


^cIncome as a percentage of the federal poverty level is determined by dividing each client's income by the federal poverty level in Table 5.8.1.1 corresponding to the client's household size. For example, for a client with a monthly income of \$1,000 who lives in a 2-person household in Virginia, his or her income as a percentage of the federal poverty level (\$1,214) is \$1,000/\$1,214, or 82.4%.

Table 5.8.2.1 shows that 10.3% of all client households had no income at all for the month prior to the interview. More details on income follow:

- 10.2% of the pantry client households had no monthly income.
- n.p. of the kitchen client households had no monthly income.
- N.A. of the shelter client households had no monthly income.
- 42.4% of all client households had monthly household income less than \$1,000.

- Average household income among all clients during the previous month was \$1,170 (median: \$1,020). By contrast, the mean for the U.S. population as a whole in 2008 was \$5,702 (median: \$4,192).¹⁷
- Average monthly household income among the pantry clients was \$1,130 (median: \$1,000).
- Average monthly household income among the kitchen clients was \$n.p. (median: \$n.p.).
- Average monthly household income among the shelter clients was \$N.A. (median: \$N.A.).
- 77.1% of client households had an income of 130% of the federal poverty level or below during the previous month.
- Average monthly household income among all client households was 72.6% (median: 65.1%) of the federal poverty level.
- Average monthly household income among pantry client households was 68.1% (median: 64.8%) of the federal poverty level.
- Average monthly household income among kitchen client households was n.p. (median: n.p.) of the federal poverty level.
- Average monthly household income among shelter client households was N.A. (median: N.A.) of the federal poverty level.

¹⁷ Computed using annual estimates found in "U.S. Census Bureau. Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2008." September 2009.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

5.8.3 Sources of Household Income for the Previous Month

Clients were asked to indicate the major source of their household income for the previous month. They were then asked to name all sources of their household income. Table 5.8.3.1 and Table 5.8.3.2 summarize the findings.

TABLE 5.8.3.1

MAIN SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR THE PREVIOUS MONTH

Main Source of Household Income for Previous Month	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Job	24.9%	n.p.	N.A.	24.3%
Government welfare assistance				
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	11.4%	n.p.	N.A.	10.3%
General Assistance (GA) ^a	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.1%
SUBTOTAL	11.4%	n.p.	N.A.	10.4%
Other government sources				
Social Security	20.2%	n.p.	N.A.	21.7%
Unemployment Compensation	10.2%	n.p.	N.A.	10.7%
Disability (SSDI)/Workers' Compensation	4.5%	n.p.	N.A.	5.5%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	7.6%	n.p.	N.A.	6.9%
SUBTOTAL	42.5%	n.p.	N.A.	44.8%
Nongovernment, nonjob sources				
Pension	1.8%	n.p.	N.A.	1.6%
Child support	3.6%	n.p.	N.A.	3.2%
Churches	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Alimony	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Relatives	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	5.4%	n.p.	N.A.	4.9%
Other ^b	1.8%	n.p.	N.A.	1.6%
No income	11.0%	n.p.	N.A.	11.2%
Unknown	3.1%	n.p.	N.A.	2.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to question 28 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table and across related tables, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.


Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.1% for pantry clients, n.p. for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 2.8% for all clients.

^aEstimates for GA and TANF should be used with caution, since some respondents may not have understood the names of the programs under which they were receiving benefits. Indeed, in some states, the regular GA program is not offered, although other sources of assistance are sometimes available and could have been confused with GA.

^bThis includes some form of limited income from savings.

Overall, 24.3% of the clients indicated that a job was the main source of income for their households for the previous month. Other sources of income are as follows:

- For 10.4% of all clients, welfare assistance from the government such as TANF or GA was the main source of household income.
- For 44.8% of all clients, other government assistance such as Social Security, Unemployment Compensation, Disability (SSDI)/Worker's Compensation, and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) was the main source of household income.
- For 4.9% of all clients, income came mainly from nongovernment, nonjob sources, such as pension and child support.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

TABLE 5.8.3.2

ALL SOURCES OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR PREVIOUS MONTH

All Sources of Household Income for Previous Month ^a	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Job	36.6%	n.p.	N.A.	35.4%
Government welfare assistance				
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	22.5%	n.p.	N.A.	20.1%
General Assistance (GA) ^b	4.4%	n.p.	N.A.	4.1%
Other government sources				
Social Security	29.7%	n.p.	N.A.	32.7%
Unemployment Compensation	16.1%	n.p.	N.A.	15.7%
Disability (SSDI)/Workers' Compensation	11.3%	n.p.	N.A.	11.7%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	18.6%	n.p.	N.A.	19.2%
Government assistance with child care costs	1.1%	n.p.	N.A.	1.0%
Nongovernment, nonjob sources				
Pension	9.2%	n.p.	N.A.	8.7%
Child support	10.7%	n.p.	N.A.	9.5%
Alimony	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Relatives	4.7%	n.p.	N.A.	5.5%
No income	11.0%	n.p.	N.A.	11.2%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 6, 25, and 27 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table and across related tables, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.


Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.9% for all clients.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bEstimates for GA and TANF should be used with caution, since some respondents may not have understood the names of the programs under which they were receiving benefits. Indeed, in some states, the regular GA program is not offered, although other sources of assistance are sometimes available and could have been confused with GA.

When clients were asked about *all* sources of their household income for the previous month, 35.4% included a job as a source.

- For 20.1% of all clients, TANF was a source of household income during the previous month.
- For 4.1%, GA was a source of household income.
- 32.7% of all clients said they received Social Security benefits
- 11.7% chose SSDI or Workers' Compensation as a source of household income.
- 19.2% mentioned SSI as a source.
- In addition, 8.7%, 9.5%, and 5.5% of the clients indicate pension, child support, and their relatives, respectively, as a source of income.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

5.8.4 Annual Household Income in 2008

Clients also provided estimates of their total household income in the year 2008. Table 5.8.4.1 shows their annual income in dollars and as a percentage of the federal poverty level.

TABLE 5.8.4.1
HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR 2008

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Total annual income				
No income	5.8%	n.p.	N.A.	6.4%
\$1-\$4,999	5.7%	n.p.	N.A.	5.2%
\$5,000-\$9,999	23.6%	n.p.	N.A.	21.5%
\$10,000-\$14,999	20.0%	n.p.	N.A.	19.7%
\$15,000-\$19,999	16.9%	n.p.	N.A.	18.2%
\$20,000-\$24,999	2.3%	n.p.	N.A.	2.9%
\$25,000-\$29,999	2.3%	n.p.	N.A.	2.4%
\$30,000-\$34,999	7.9%	n.p.	N.A.	7.0%
\$35,000-\$39,999	4.7%	n.p.	N.A.	5.4%
\$40,000-\$44,999	0.9%	n.p.	N.A.	0.8%
\$45,000-\$49,999	1.5%	n.p.	N.A.	1.3%
\$50,000 and over	1.9%	n.p.	N.A.	1.7%
Unknown	6.5%	n.p.	N.A.	7.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Average annual income among valid responses (in dollars) ^a	15,860	n.p.	N.A.	16,010
Median annual income among valid responses (in dollars)	12,240	n.p.	N.A.	13,000
Income as a percentage of the federal poverty level ^{b,c}				
0% (no income) ^d	5.8%	n.p.	N.A.	6.4%
1%-50%	27.7%	n.p.	N.A.	25.1%
51%-75%	21.4%	n.p.	N.A.	22.2%
76%-100%	10.6%	n.p.	N.A.	10.9%
101%-130%	10.0%	n.p.	N.A.	9.9%
131%-150%	3.9%	n.p.	N.A.	3.8%
151%-185%	10.7%	n.p.	N.A.	10.0%
186% or higher	3.3%	n.p.	N.A.	4.3%
Unknown	6.5%	n.p.	N.A.	7.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Average annual income as percentage of the poverty level among valid responses	80.7%	n.p.	N.A.	83.9%
Median annual income as percentage of the poverty level among valid responses	74.7%	n.p.	N.A.	74.7%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to Question 29 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

For total annual income, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.5% for pantry clients, n.p. for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 7.5% for all clients. The missing rates we report here were obtained after we cross-imputed missing responses for monthly and yearly income variables.

For income as percentage of the federal poverty level, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.5% for pantry clients, n.p. for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 7.5% for all clients.

^aFor the calculation of the average and the median, responses given as a range were recoded to be the midpoint of the bracket.

^bSee Table 5.8.1.1 for the monthly federal poverty levels (and multiply by 12 to obtain annual levels). See Table 5.8.1.2 for an example of how to compute income as a percentage of the federal poverty level.


^cIncome as a percentage of the federal poverty level is determined by dividing each client's annual income by 12 times the federal poverty level in Table 5.8.1.1 corresponding to the client's household size. For example, for a client with an annual income of \$12,000 who lives in a 2-person household in Virginia, his or her annual income as a percentage of the federal poverty level ($\$1,214 \times 12$) is $\$12,000 / (\$1,214 \times 12)$, or 82.4%.

^dThe percentages in this row may not be equal to those in the corresponding row of the upper panel of this table, because the two panels of data may have different item nonresponse rates. The calculation in the lower panel required information about household size as well as household income.

In the year 2008, 33.1% of all clients had a household income less than \$10,000. More information about annual income of client households follows:

- Average household income among all clients in year 2008 was \$16,010.
- 74.5% of the clients' households had an income of 130% of the federal poverty level or below.

- Average household income as percentage of the federal poverty level was 83.9% (median: 74.7%).



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p" or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

5.8.5 Education and Income in 2008

Not surprisingly, education status is highly correlated with income (Table 5.8.5.1).

TABLE 5.8.5.1

INCOME IN 2008, BY EDUCATION

Income in 2008 as a Percentage of Federal Poverty Level ^a	Highest Education Level Achieved					
	All Clients	Less than High School	Completed High School	Completed Noncollege/ Business/ Technical School	Some College/ Two-Year Degree	Completed College
0% (no income)	6.9%	10.7%	10.3%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
1%-50%	25.7%	40.5%	24.6%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
51%-75%	18.5%	20.5%	19.2%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
76%-100%	18.7%	14.3%	17.4%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
101%-130%	11.1%	1.7%	12.6%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	80.9%	87.7%	84.1%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
131%-150%	4.2%	0.0%	1.4%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
151%-185%	10.1%	5.7%	14.6%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
186% or higher	4.8%	6.6%	0.0%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	19.1%	12.3%	15.9%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	108	34	36	5	28	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 10 and 29 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

For income as percentage of the federal poverty level, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 7.7% for all clients, 1.3% for clients who completed less than high school, 4.8% for clients who completed high school, 0.0% for clients who completed noncollege schooling, 1.5% for clients who completed some college, and 0.2% for clients who completed college.

^aSee Table 5.8.1.1 for the monthly federal poverty levels (and multiply by 12 to obtain annual levels).

Findings presented in Table 5.8.5.1 include:

- In 2008, 87.7% of the clients who had not completed high school and 84.1% of the clients who had completed up to high school had either no income or an income less than 130% of the federal poverty level. In addition, n.p. of the clients

who had completed college had either no income or an income less than 130% of the federal poverty level.

- The percentage of the clients who had an income more than 130% of the federal poverty level in 2008 is only 12.3% among the clients who had not completed high school. It is as high as n.p. among the clients who had completed college.

5.8.6 Presence of Elderly or Children and Income in 2008

Table 5.8.6.1 shows differences in income between households with various household structures.

TABLE 5.8.6.1
INCOME IN 2008, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN

Income in 2008 as Percentage of Federal Poverty Level ^a	All Households	Households with Seniors	Households with Children, No Seniors	One-Person Households with Neither Children nor Seniors	Households with Two or More People but with Neither Children nor Seniors
0% (no income)	6.9%	n.p.	4.6%	n.p.	n.p.
1%-50%	27.2%	n.p.	32.6%	n.p.	n.p.
51%-75%	17.8%	n.p.	23.1%	n.p.	n.p.
76%-100%	18.0%	n.p.	11.2%	n.p.	n.p.
101%-130%	10.7%	n.p.	11.5%	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL ^a	80.6%	n.p.	83.1%	n.p.	n.p.
131%-150%	4.1%	n.p.	2.0%	n.p.	n.p.
151%-185%	10.8%	n.p.	11.8%	n.p.	n.p.
186% or higher	4.6%	n.p.	3.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	19.4%	n.p.	16.9%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	112	13	59	25	15

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 3, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7, and 29 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

For income as percentage of the federal poverty level, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 7.5% for all households, 0.4% for households with seniors, 1.8% for households with seniors and no children, 2.2% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, and 3.0% for households with two or more people but neither seniors nor children.

^aSee Table 5.8.1.1 for the monthly federal poverty levels (and multiply by 12 to obtain annual levels).

Key findings include:

- The percentage of one-person households with neither children nor seniors without income is n.p.. For all households, this percentage is 6.9%.
- The percentage of households with two or more people but without seniors or children who have incomes above 130% of the federal poverty level is n.p.. For all households in the population, the percentage is 19.4%.

5.9 HOUSING

5.9.1 Housing Status

Table 5.9.1.1 shows the housing status of the client households. It shows whether they have a place to live, what kind of housing they have, whether they own or rent, and what their other housing-related experiences have been.

TABLE 5.9.1.1
HOUSING STATUS

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Clients with a place to live				
House	35.6%	n.p.	N.A.	32.8%
Mobile home/trailer	9.1%	n.p.	N.A.	9.9%
Apartment	47.7%	n.p.	N.A.	46.2%
Room	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Motel/Hotel	0.8%	n.p.	N.A.	0.7%
Live with family, friends	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	93.2%	n.p.	N.A.	89.5%
Clients without a place to live				
Homeless, living in shelter or mission	2.0%	n.p.	N.A.	2.9%
Homeless, living on the street	2.8%	n.p.	N.A.	4.3%
Car, van, or recreational vehicle	2.1%	n.p.	N.A.	3.2%
Abandoned building	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	6.8%	n.p.	N.A.	10.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125
Among clients who have a place to live				
Own the place you live	18.0%	n.p.	N.A.	17.2%
Rent your place	74.6%	n.p.	N.A.	75.9%
Live free with someone else	3.7%	n.p.	N.A.	3.6%
Other ^a	3.6%	n.p.	N.A.	3.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Clients late paying the last month's rent or mortgage	25.5%	n.p.	N.A.	26.8%
Clients whose households receive Section 8 or Public Housing Assistance	28.7%	n.p.	N.A.	29.5%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	92	17	N.A.	109

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 16, 17, 18, and 81 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the kind of place where living, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.9% for pantry clients, 6.4% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 2.4% for all clients.

For those with a place to live, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for pantry clients, 3.7% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.4% for all clients.


For those late paying rent or mortgage, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.5% for pantry clients, 2.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 2.5% for all clients.

For those receiving Section 8 or Public Housing Assistance, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 13.5% for pantry clients, 22.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 14.5% for all clients.

^aThis includes "working for rent" and halfway houses.

Among all client households, 10.5% were without a place to live. More details on housing status of the clients follow:

- N.A. of shelter client households were without a place to live.
- n.p. of kitchen client households were without a place to live.
- 6.8% of pantry client households were without a place to live.
- 18.0% of pantry client households with a place to live own the place where they live.
- 26.8% of the client households with a place to live were late paying the previous month's rent or mortgage.
- 29.5% of the client households with a place to live said they received Section 8 or Public Housing Assistance at the time of the interview.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

Table 5.9.1.2 compares income levels for clients who reported being without a place to live with income levels for those who have a place to live.

TABLE 5.9.1.2
INCOME IN 2008, BY HOUSING STATUS

Income in 2008 as Percentage of Federal Poverty Level ^a	All Clients	Housing Status	
		Clients with a Place to Live	Clients Without a Place to Live
0% (no income)	7.0%	3.7%	n.p.
1%-50%	27.6%	26.7%	n.p.
51%-75%	18.1%	19.0%	n.p.
76%-100%	17.5%	19.3%	n.p.
101%-130%	10.1%	11.1%	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	80.2%	79.8%	n.p.
131%-150%	4.1%	4.6%	n.p.
151%-185%	10.9%	12.1%	n.p.
186% or Higher	4.7%	3.6%	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	19.8%	20.2%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	110	99	11

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 16 and 29 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

For income as percentage of the federal poverty level, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.7% for all clients, 5.1% for clients with a place to live, and 1.6% for clients without a place to live.

^aSee Table 5.8.1.1 for the monthly federal poverty levels (and multiply by 12 to obtain annual levels).

Key findings include:

- The percentage of the clients who were without a place to live that had no income in 2008 is n.p., compared with only 3.7% of the clients who have a place to live.
- In 2008, among the clients who had a place to live, 79.8% had income less than or equal to 130% of the federal poverty level, while 20.2% had income above 130% of the federal poverty level.

- In 2008, among the clients who were without a place to live, n.p. had income less than or equal to 130% of the federal poverty level, while n.p. had income above 130% of the federal poverty level.

Table 5.9.1.3 describes the association between income and home ownership among clients with a place to live.

TABLE 5.9.1.3
INCOME IN 2008, BY HOME OWNERSHIP

Income in 2008 as Percentage of Federal Poverty Level ^a	All Clients with a Place to Live	Clients Who Own a Place	Clients Who Rent a Place	Clients Who Live with Someone for Free	Other
0% (no income)	3.7%	n.p.	4.7%	n.p.	n.p.
1%-50%	26.9%	n.p.	25.7%	n.p.	n.p.
51%-75%	19.1%	n.p.	21.0%	n.p.	n.p.
76%-100%	19.4%	n.p.	22.9%	n.p.	n.p.
101%-130%	11.1%	n.p.	12.7%	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	80.2%	n.p.	87.1%	n.p.	n.p.
131%-150%	4.6%	n.p.	5.2%	n.p.	n.p.
151%-185%	11.5%	n.p.	4.7%	n.p.	n.p.
186% or higher	3.6%	n.p.	3.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	19.8%	n.p.	12.9%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	95	20	70	1	4

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 16 and 29 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

For income as percentage of the federal poverty level, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 5.0% for all clients, 3.0% for clients who own a place, 2.0% for clients who rent a place, 0.1% for clients who live with someone for free, and 0.0% for clients with some other living arrangement.

^aSee Table 5.8.1.1 for the monthly federal poverty levels (and multiply by 12 to obtain annual levels).

Among the findings illustrated by the table are:

- n.p. of the clients who own a place to live, 4.7% of the clients who rent, and n.p. of the clients who live with someone else for free had no income in 2008.

- n.p. of the clients who own a place to live, 87.1% of the clients who rent, and n.p. of the clients who live with someone else for free had either no income or an income at or below 130% of the federal poverty level.
- On the other hand, n.p. of the clients who own a place to live, 12.9% of the clients who rent, and n.p. of the clients who live with someone else for free had an income over 130% of the federal poverty level.

5.9.2 Household Resources

Clients indicated whether their households have access to a kitchen, a working telephone, or a working car. Responses are presented in Table 5.9.2.1.

TABLE 5.9.2.1
HOUSEHOLD RESOURCES

Household Resources	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Clients have access to a place where they can prepare a meal				
Yes	95.8%	n.p.	N.A.	93.0%
No	4.2%	n.p.	N.A.	7.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Clients have access to a working telephone				
Yes	93.2%	n.p.	N.A.	89.6%
No	6.8%	n.p.	N.A.	10.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Clients have access to a working car				
Yes	82.3%	n.p.	N.A.	80.1%
No	17.7%	n.p.	N.A.	19.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 19 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.


For access to a place to prepare a meal, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for pantry clients, 2.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.2% for all clients.

For access to a working telephone, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for pantry clients, 5.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.5% for all clients.

For clients with access to a working car, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for pantry clients, 3.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.3% for all clients.

Findings about selected household resources presented in Table 5.9.2.1 include:

- Overall, 93.0% of the clients have access to a place where they can prepare a meal. The percentages of pantry, kitchen, and shelter clients who have access to such a place are 95.8%, n.p., and N.A., respectively.
- Overall, 89.6% of the clients have access to a working telephone. The percentages of pantry, kitchen, and shelter clients who have access to a working telephone are 93.2%, n.p., and N.A., respectively.
- Overall, 80.1% of the clients have access to a working car. The percentages of pantry, kitchen, and shelter clients who have access to a working car are 82.3%, n.p., and N.A., respectively.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

6. CLIENTS: FOOD INSECURITY

Food insecurity is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon that varies along a continuum of successive stages as it becomes more severe. A scaling tool developed by the USDA provides an important approach being used increasingly to assess food security among households. Six questions in a six-item short module, the minimal information required to construct the scale, were included in the client survey.¹⁸ Food security and food insecurity are conceptually defined as the following:¹⁹

- Food security: “Access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life. Food security includes at a minimum: (1) the ready availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods, and (2) an assured ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways (e.g., without resorting to emergency food supplies, scavenging, stealing, or other coping strategies).”
- Food insecurity: “Limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods or limited or uncertain ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways.”

Previous *Hunger in America* studies further classified food-insecure individuals and households as “food insecure without hunger” and “food insecure with hunger.” Changes in these descriptions to “food insecure with low food security” and “food insecure with very low food security,” respectively, were made in 2006 at the recommendation of the Committee on National Statistics in order to distinguish the physiological state of hunger from indicators of

¹⁸ Bickel, Gary, Mark Nord, Cristofer Price, William Hamilton, and John Cook. “Guide to Measuring Household Food Security, Revised 2000.” U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, March 2000.

¹⁹ “Core Indicators of Nutritional State for Difficult-to-Sample Populations.” *Journal of Nutrition*, vol. 120, no.11S, November 1990.

food availability.²⁰ While the terminology changed, the classification of households into the three food security levels remained the same. Clients responded to a six-item short module for classifying households by food security status level (the same module was used in *Hunger in America 2006*). Food security scale scores were assigned to households according to the “Guide to Measuring Household Food Security, Revised 2000.”²¹

The main distinction between a household being classified as having very low food security and low food security is that households with very low food security have had one or more members experience reductions in food intake or disruptions in eating patterns due to a lack of adequate resources for food. Households with low food security, while faced with food-access problems, typically do not experience incidents of reduced food intake.

This chapter begins by assessing clients’ levels of food security, first for all households and then separately for households with children and for households with elderly members. Cross-tabulations with household income levels, participation in federal food assistance programs, and several demographic characteristics are also examined. Subsequent sections then provide data on household responses to the specific questions used in constructing the food security scores.

²⁰ Mark Nord, Margaret Andrews, and Steven Carlson. “Household Food Security in the United States, 2007.” U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, 2008. Economic Research Report No. 66 (ERS-66) November 2008.

²¹ Bickel et al. March 2000.

6.1 HOUSEHOLD FOOD INSECURITY

In this section, we examine household food insecurity across a variety of populations.

6.1.1 Household Food Insecurity and Household Composition

Table 6.1.1.1 describes the prevalence of food insecurity among all households, households with children, and households with elderly members based on self-reported information about household food situations.

TABLE 6.1.1.1
HOUSEHOLD FOOD INSECURITY

Food Security Among Clients' Households	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Food security among all households				
Food secure	16.4%	n.p.	N.A.	17.4%
Food insecure				
With low food security	32.8%	n.p.	N.A.	32.0%
With very low food security	50.8%	n.p.	N.A.	50.6%
SUBTOTAL	83.6%	n.p.	N.A.	82.6%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125
Food security among households with children younger than age 18				
Food secure	12.2%	n.p.	N.A.	12.7%
Food insecure				
With low food security	35.3%	n.p.	N.A.	36.5%
With very low food security	52.5%	n.p.	N.A.	50.9%
SUBTOTAL	87.8%	n.p.	N.A.	87.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	60	7	N.A.	67
Food security among households with seniors age 65 or older				
Food secure	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Food insecure				
With low food security	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
With very low food security	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
TOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.

Food Security Among Clients' Households	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	13	3	N.A.	16

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to Bickel et al. (2000).

For all households, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.2% for pantry clients, 2.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.3% for all clients.



For households with children younger than age 18, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.0% for all clients.


For households with seniors, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.9% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.8% for all clients.

According to the six-item short module, 32.0% of all client households of the emergency food programs had low food security. Another 50.6% had very low food security. Combined, a total of 82.6% were food insecure. Other findings include:

- Among the client households with children younger than age 18, 36.5% had low food security and 50.9% had very low food security.
- Among the client households with seniors age 65 years or older, n.p. had low food security and n.p. had very low food security.

The results in Table 6.1.1.1 suggest that 17.4% households are food secure. There are several reasons that may help to explain the apparent paradox that food secure households are seeking emergency food from pantries, kitchens, and shelters. The questions on which the food security estimates are based ask about client food situations over the last twelve months and thus may not properly characterize current circumstances. In addition, the emergency food assistance that respondents receive may ameliorate their food situations by enough to make them food secure, but their situations could be drastically different in the absence of this assistance.





Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

Food insecurity may cause particular hardships in households with children or seniors. Below, we explore associations between food security and the presence of children younger than 18, children younger than 5, and senior household members.

Table 6.1.1.2 shows that 87.3% of client households with children under 18 are food insecure, while the percentage among childless households is 76.4%. In Table 6.1.1.3, we present the same table for households with and without young children.

TABLE 6.1.1.2
FOOD INSECURITY, BY PRESENCE OF CHILDREN

	All Client Households	Households With or Without Children Younger than 18	
		With Children Younger than 18	Without Children Younger than 18
Food secure	17.4%	12.7%	23.6%
Food insecure with low food security	32.0%	36.5%	26.2%
Food insecure with very low food security	50.6%	50.9%	50.2%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	122	67	55

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 6b, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to Bickel et al. (2000).

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.3% for all clients, 0.0% for households with children younger than age 18, and 1.3% for households without children younger than age 18.

TABLE 6.1.1.3

FOOD INSECURITY, BY PRESENCE OF YOUNG CHILDREN

	All Client Households	Households With or Without Children Ages 0-5	
		With Children Ages 0-5	Without Children Ages 0-5
Food secure	17.4%	17.3%	17.4%
Food insecure with low food security	32.0%	41.7%	28.7%
Food insecure with very low food security	50.6%	41.0%	53.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	122	32	90

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 7, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to Bickel et al. (2000).

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.3% for all clients, 0.0% for households with children ages 0-5, and 1.3% for households without children ages 0-5.

Specific findings include:

- 50.9% of client households with children under 18 and 41.0% with children ages 0 to 5 are classified as having very low food security.
- 36.5% of client households with children under 18 and 41.7% of those with children ages 0 to 5 are classified as having low food security.

To further the relationship between household composition and food security, Table 6.1.1.4 breaks down household composition in terms of both the presence of children younger than 18 and the presence of seniors age 65 or older. There are four panels in the table, the top panel showing the tabulations for the entire client data and the subsequent three disaggregating the analysis by type of program.

TABLE 6.1.1.4

FOOD INSECURITY, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN

	All Households	Households with Seniors	Households with Children, No Seniors	One-Person Households with Neither Children nor Seniors	Households with Two or More People but with Neither Children nor Seniors
For All Three Programs					
Food secure	17.4%	n.p.	13.1%	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with low food security	32.0%	n.p.	36.7%	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with very low food security	50.6%	n.p.	50.2%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	122	15	63	27	17
For Pantry Programs					
Food secure	16.4%	n.p.	12.6%	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with low food security	32.8%	n.p.	35.4%	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with very low food security	50.8%	n.p.	51.9%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	99	12	57	17	13
For Kitchen Programs					
Food secure	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with low food security	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with very low food security	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	23	3	6	10	4
For Shelter Programs					

	All Households	Households with Seniors	Households with Children, No Seniors	One-Person Households with Neither Children nor Seniors	Households with Two or More People but with Neither Children nor Seniors
Food secure	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with low food security	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with very low food security	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	0	0	0	0

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 3, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to Bickel et al. (2000).

For all clients, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.3% for clients in all households, 0.1% for clients in households with seniors, 0.0% for clients in households with children and no seniors, 0.3% for clients in one-person households with neither children nor seniors, and 0.9% for clients in households with two or more people but with neither children nor seniors.

For pantry clients, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.2% for clients in all households, 0.1% for clients in households with seniors, 0.0% for clients in households with children and no seniors, 0.0% for clients in one-person households with neither children nor seniors, and 1.1% for clients in households with two or more people but with neither children nor seniors.

For kitchen clients, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.6% for clients in all households, 0.0% for clients in households with seniors, 0.0% for clients in households with children and no seniors, 2.6% for clients in one-person households with neither children nor seniors, and 0.0% for clients in households with two or more people but with neither children nor seniors.

For shelter clients, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for clients in all households, 0.0% for clients in households with seniors, 0.0% for clients in households with children and no seniors, 0.0% for clients in one-person households with neither children nor seniors, and 0.0% for clients in households with two or more people but with neither children nor seniors.

Key findings include:

- For the overall sample, 36.7% of households with children and no seniors are food insecure with low food security compared to n.p. of households with seniors.

In addition, 50.2% of households with children and no seniors are food insecure with very low food security compared to n.p. of households with seniors.

- For pantry and kitchen programs, rates of very low food security for one-person households with neither children nor elderly members are n.p. and n.p., respectively.
- For shelters, the percentage of two-person households with neither seniors nor children that have very low food security is n.p..

6.1.2 Household Food Insecurity and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation

As will be discussed in detail in Chapter 7, about 56.8% of client households also receive benefits from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Associations between food security and SNAP benefit receipt are of interest for at least two reasons. On the one hand, it is important that the households who are least food secure have effective access to the major government nutrition assistance programs, such as SNAP. On the other hand, it is of interest to examine whether SNAP benefit receipt appears to increase food security, recognizing, however, that causality may be difficult to establish in a cross-sectional study such as this one.

Table 6.1.2.1 compares food security status among SNAP participants to that of eligible and ineligible nonparticipants.

TABLE 6.1.2.1

FOOD INSECURITY, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Food Security Among Clients' Households	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Among SNAP participants				
Food secure	15.4%	n.p.	N.A.	16.0%
Food insecure				
With low food security	24.6%	n.p.	N.A.	26.0%
With very low food security	60.0%	n.p.	N.A.	58.0%
SUBTOTAL	84.6%	n.p.	N.A.	84.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	52	15	N.A.	67
Among SNAP eligible nonparticipants ^a				
Food secure	9.2%	n.p.	n.p.	9.7%
Food insecure				
With low food security	29.7%	n.p.	n.p.	29.5%
With very low food security	61.1%	n.p.	n.p.	60.9%
SUBTOTAL	90.8%	n.p.	N.A.	90.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	31	3	0	34

Food Security Among Clients' Households	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Among SNAP ineligible nonparticipants ^a				
Food secure	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure				
With low food security	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
With very low food security	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	N.A.	N.A.	n.p.
TOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	10	3	0	13
Among SNAP nonparticipants ^b				
Food secure	17.8%	n.p.	N.A.	19.3%
Food insecure				
With low food security	42.9%	n.p.	N.A.	40.1%
With very low food security	39.3%	n.p.	N.A.	40.6%
SUBTOTAL	82.2%	n.p.	N.A.	80.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	49	9	N.A.	58

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to "Guide to Measuring Household Food Security, Revised 2000."

For participating households, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.2% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.2% for all clients.

For nonparticipating households, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.3% for pantry clients, 9.2% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 2.8% for all clients.

^a Eligibility based on the previous month's income alone.

^b The coding of SNAP participants versus nonparticipants depends on the survey question asking whether the client participates in SNAP. Among nonparticipants, however, the coding that divides the group into eligibles and ineligibles depends on income. Because there are clients who respond to the SNAP participation question but do not respond to the income question, the sum of the number of eligible and ineligible nonparticipants may not equal the total number of nonparticipants.

Specific findings in this analysis include:

- 26.0% of the client households receiving SNAP benefits had low food security and another 58.0% had very low food security.

- Among the client households that are eligible to participate but are not receiving SNAP benefits, 29.5% and 60.9% had low and very low food security, respectively.
- Among households apparently ineligible for SNAP benefits, n.p. and n.p. had low or very low food security, respectively.

Note that the fact that substantial numbers of client households are classified as hungry despite receiving SNAP benefits does not by itself mean that SNAP is not providing useful assistance. Indeed, many of these households might be much worse off without SNAP benefits. However, the data suggest that, for many households in the FA network, SNAP benefits may not be sufficient to prevent the reductions in food intake or disruptions in eating patterns.

6.1.3 Household Food Insecurity and Household Income

Table 6.1.3.1 and Table 6.1.3.2 examine the relationship between income and food security. Table 6.1.3.1 presents the percentage of client households that are food secure and food insecure for households grouped by income relative to the federal poverty level. Table 6.1.3.2 describes the distribution of household income for client households grouped by food security status.

TABLE 6.1.3.1
FOOD INSECURITY, BY INCOME IN 2008

	All Client Households	Income in 2008	
		0% to 130% of Federal Poverty Level ^a	131% of Federal Poverty Level or Higher ^a
Food secure	17.3%	12.6%	n.p.
Food insecure with low food security	31.1%	26.7%	n.p.
Food insecure with very low food security	51.6%	60.7%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	110	89	21

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 29, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to Bickel et al. (2000).

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.4% for all clients, 0.1% for households with income at 0% to 130% of the federal poverty level, and 0.3% for households with income at 131% of the federal poverty level or higher.

^aSee Table 5.8.1.1 for the monthly federal poverty levels (and multiply by 12 to obtain annual levels).

We find that among the households with incomes less than or equal to 130% of the federal poverty level in year 2008, 12.6% are food secure, while n.p. of the households with incomes higher than 130% of the federal poverty level are food secure. On the other hand, as many as 60.7% of the client households with income less than or equal to 130% of the federal poverty level have very low food security. The comparable figure is n.p. for the households with income more than 130% of the federal poverty level.

Table 6.1.3.2 presents the distribution of income as a percentage of the Federal Poverty Level for client households according to the households' food security status.

TABLE 6.1.3.2
INCOME IN 2008, BY FOOD SECURITY STATUS

Income in 2008 as Percentage of Federal Poverty Level ^a	All Client Households	Food Security Status at Client Households		
		Food Secure	Food Insecure with Low Food Security	Food Insecure with Very Low Food Security
0% (no income)	6.9%	n.p.	8.4%	7.9%
1%-50%	27.3%	n.p.	29.8%	30.2%
51%-75%	17.9%	n.p.	11.2%	24.9%
76%-100%	18.0%	n.p.	10.0%	24.0%
101%-130%	10.7%	n.p.	9.8%	8.0%
SUBTOTAL	80.8%	n.p.	69.4%	95.0%
131%-150%	3.8%	n.p.	0.5%	0.0%
151%-185%	10.8%	n.p.	24.1%	2.8%
186% or higher	4.6%	n.p.	6.0%	2.1%
SUBTOTAL	19.2%	n.p.	30.6%	5.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	110	24	41	45

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on all responses to questions 29, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table, unlike those in most other tables, were calculated without leaving out item nonresponses. To ensure that key percentages, such as that for no income, appear consistent within this table, a constant denominator, which includes item nonresponses, was used. All responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients or households of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.

For income as percentage of the federal poverty level, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.6% for all clients, 1.2% for households that are food secure, 3.0% for households that are food insecure with low security, and 2.4% for households that are food insecure with very low security.

Other findings include:

- In 2008, 95.0% of the client households characterized as having very low food security, 69.4% of those characterized as having low food security, and n.p. of those characterized as food secure had income less than or equal to 130% of the federal poverty level.
- In 2008, 5.0% of the client households characterized as having very low food security, 30.6% of those characterized as having low food security, and n.p. of those characterized as food secure had income more than 130% of the federal poverty level.

6.1.4 Household Food Insecurity and Health

Table 6.1.4.1 presents food security rates for client households grouped by whether a member of the household is in poor health.

TABLE 6.1.4.1
FOOD INSECURITY, BY HEALTH STATUS

	All Households	Households with or Without Members in Poor Health	
		With Members in Poor Health	Without Members in Poor Health
Food secure	17.4%	14.0%	19.7%
Food insecure with low food security	32.0%	38.3%	27.7%
Food insecure with very low food security	50.6%	47.7%	52.6%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	122	42	80

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 20, 21, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to Bickel et al. (2000).

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.4% for all clients, 0.1% for households with members in poor health, and 0.3% for households without members in poor health.

We find that among the client households with at least one member in poor health, 14.0% are food secure; 38.3% have low food security; and 47.7% have very low food security. In addition, among the client households with no one in poor health, 19.7% are food secure; 27.7% have low food security; and 52.6% have very low food security.

6.1.5 Household Food Insecurity and Citizenship Status

Table 6.1.5.1 examines associations between citizenship status and food security among client households.

TABLE 6.1.5.1
FOOD INSECURITY, BY CITIZENSHIP STATUS

		Citizenship Status of Clients at Program Sites	
		Households Represented by Citizen Clients ^a	Households Represented by Noncitizen Clients
	All Client Households		
Food secure	15.2%	13.0%	n.p.
Food insecure with low food security	32.7%	30.2%	n.p.
Food insecure with very low food security	52.1%	56.8%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	118	96	22

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 5, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to Bickel et al. (2000).

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for all clients, 1.1% for households represented by citizen clients, and 0.0% for households represented by noncitizen clients.

^aHouseholds represented by respondents who are U.S. citizens.

The table shows that n.p. of the noncitizen households have low food security, compared with 30.2% of the citizen households. In addition, n.p. of the noncitizen households have very low food security, compared with 56.8% of the citizen households.

Table 6.1.5.2 contrasts, within noncitizen households, food security rates for households that have and do not have young children.

TABLE 6.1.5.2

FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS CONTAINING AT LEAST ONE NONCITIZEN,
BY PRESENCE OF YOUNG CHILDREN

	All Client Households Having at Least One Noncitizen Member	Noncitizen Households With or Without Children Ages 0-5	
		With Children Ages 0-5	Without Children Ages 0-5
Food secure	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with low food security	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Food insecure with very low food security	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	27	18	9

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 5, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Constructed according to Bickel et al. (2000).

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for all client households with at least one noncitizen member, 0.0% for noncitizen households with children ages 0-5, and 0.0% for noncitizen households without children ages 0-5.

We find that n.p. of noncitizen households with young children are classified as food secure, compared with n.p. of those households without them.

6.2 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY IN HOUSEHOLDS

Table 6.2.1 presents responses to two of the questions involved in the six-item short module.

TABLE 6.2.1
INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY IN HOUSEHOLDS

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
<i>“The food we bought just didn’t last, and we didn’t have money to get more.” In the last 12 months, was that...?</i>				
Often true	50.9%	n.p.	N.A.	51.0%
Sometimes true	41.4%	n.p.	N.A.	41.2%
Never true	7.8%	n.p.	N.A.	7.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
<i>“We couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals.” In the last 12 months, was that...?</i>				
Often true	29.3%	n.p.	N.A.	32.3%
Sometimes true	47.6%	n.p.	N.A.	46.0%
Never true	23.1%	n.p.	N.A.	21.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 42 and 43 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don’t know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the first food security indicator in the table, missing, don’t know, and refusal responses combined are 2.7% for pantry clients, 16.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.1% for all clients.

For the second food security indicator in the table, missing, don’t know, and refusal responses combined are 3.5% for pantry clients, 21.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 5.4% for all clients.

Overall, 92.2% of the client households reported that, during the previous 12 months, they had been in a situation where the food they bought “just didn’t last” and [they] did not have money to get more. In addition, 78.3% of the client households were, often or sometimes during the previous 12 months, in a situation where they “couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals.”

Table 6.2.2 examines the associations between the responses presented in Table 6.2.1 and participation and eligibility in SNAP. There are a number of reasons why SNAP benefit receipt and food security might be associated. On the one hand, SNAP benefit receipt may increase food security, other things being equal. On the other hand, food insecurity may influence households to apply for SNAP benefits. Other types of associations caused by both SNAP participation and food security being determined by other factors are also possible.

TABLE 6.2.2

INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY IN HOUSEHOLDS, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION
ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFIT RECEIPT

	All Client Households with Valid SNAP Benefit Receipt Status	SNAP Benefit Receipt Status of Households		
		Receiving SNAP Benefits	Apparently Eligible, not Receiving	Apparently Ineligible Because of Income, not Receiving ^a
<i>“The food we bought just didn’t last, and we didn’t have money to get more.” In the last 12 months, was that ... ?^b</i>				
Often true	53.0%	57.3%	55.9%	n.p.
Sometimes true	39.6%	39.6%	34.1%	n.p.
Never true	7.5%	3.1%	10.0%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	110	65	33	12
<i>“We couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals.” In the last 12 months, was that ... ?^b</i>				
Often true	32.1%	40.0%	29.3%	n.p.
Sometimes true	45.2%	40.2%	49.4%	n.p.
Never true	22.6%	19.8%	21.3%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	109	64	33	12

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 29, 31, 42, and 43 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don’t know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the first survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.1% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 1.7% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 0.9% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 0.5% for ineligible clients.

For the second survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.7% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 1.8% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 0.9% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 1.0% for ineligible clients.

^aEligibility was determined based on the previous month's income alone.

^bA "valid" SNAP benefit receipt status is one in which all participation and eligibility (i.e. income) questions have valid responses.

Key findings include:

- 57.3% of SNAP benefit recipients and 55.9% of apparently eligible nonparticipants said that it was "often true" that food did not last and there was no money to buy more; the comparable percentage for apparently ineligible clients was n.p..
- 40.0% of SNAP benefit recipients and 29.3% of apparently eligible nonparticipants said that it was "often true" that they could not afford to eat balanced meals; the comparable percentage for apparently ineligible clients was n.p..

6.3 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG ADULTS

Table 6.3.1 presents responses to the four questions about adults in the six-item short module.

TABLE 6.3.1
INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG ADULTS

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
How often adult clients or other adults in the household cut the size of meals or skipped meals because there wasn't enough money for food in the previous 12 months ^a				
Almost every month	42.7%	n.p.	N.A.	41.5%
Some months but not every month	21.5%	n.p.	N.A.	20.6%
Only one or two months	4.1%	n.p.	N.A.	3.7%
Never	31.7%	n.p.	N.A.	34.1%
Clients who ate less than they felt they should because there wasn't enough money to buy food in the previous 12 months				
Yes	71.9%	n.p.	N.A.	72.4%
No	28.1%	n.p.	N.A.	27.6%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Clients who were hungry but didn't eat because they couldn't afford enough food in the previous 12 months				
Yes	58.2%	n.p.	N.A.	57.7%
No	41.8%	n.p.	N.A.	42.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Clients or other adults in the household ever did not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food in the previous 12 months				
Yes	36.6%	n.p.	N.A.	37.3%
No	63.4%	n.p.	N.A.	62.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 44, 44a, 45, 46, and 47 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the first food security indicator in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.5% for pantry clients, 2.9% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.6% for all clients.

For the second food security indicator in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.5% for pantry clients, 24.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.0% for all clients.

For the third food security indicator in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.2% for pantry clients, 12.1% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.2% for all clients.

For the fourth food security indicator in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.1% for pantry clients, 24.2% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.4% for all clients.

^aResponses may not add up to 100% because this panel was constructed from two questions: "Never" came from Question 44, and the other responses from Question 44a.

Adults in 41.5% of the client households had to cut the size of meals or skip meals because there was not enough money for food *almost every month* of the previous 12 months.

Responses to the remaining three questions are:

- 72.4% of the clients ate less than they felt they should because there was not enough money to buy food at least once during the previous 12 months.
- Adults in 57.7% of the client households were hungry but did not eat because they could not afford enough food at least once during the previous 12 months.
- Adults in 37.3% of the client households did not eat for a whole day at least once during the previous 12 months because there was not enough money for food.

Table 6.3.2 examines the associations between the responses presented in Table 6.3.1 and participation and eligibility in SNAP.

TABLE 6.3.2

INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG ADULTS, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFIT RECEIPT

	All Client Households with Valid SNAP Benefit Receipt Status ^a	SNAP Benefit Receipt Status of Households		
		Receiving SNAP Benefits	Apparently Eligible, Not Receiving	Apparently Ineligible Because of Income, Not Receiving ^b
How often adult clients or other adults in the household cut the size of meals or skipped meals because there wasn't enough money for food in the previous 12 months				
Almost every month	42.0%	40.1%	53.5%	n.p.
Some months but not every month	21.6%	23.6%	27.8%	n.p.
Only one or two months	3.9%	5.0%	2.4%	n.p.
Never	32.4%	31.4%	16.3%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	110	64	33	13
Clients who ate less than they felt they should because there wasn't enough money to buy food in the previous 12 months				
Yes	74.6%	73.8%	83.5%	n.p.
No	25.4%	26.2%	16.5%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	109	62	34	13
Clients who were hungry but didn't eat because they couldn't afford enough food in the previous 12 months				
Yes	58.6%	64.1%	72.9%	n.p.
No	41.4%	35.9%	27.1%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	108	62	33	13

	All Client Households with Valid SNAP Benefit Receipt Status ^a	SNAP Benefit Receipt Status of Households		
		Receiving SNAP Benefits	Apparently Eligible, Not Receiving	Apparently Ineligible Because of Income, Not Receiving ^b
Clients or other adults in the household ever did not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food in the previous 12 months				
Yes	38.0%	48.6%	33.2%	n.p.
No	62.0%	51.4%	66.8%	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	109	62	34	13

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 29, 31, 44a, 45, 46, and 47 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the first survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.2% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 1.5% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 0.3% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 0.3% for ineligible clients.

For the second survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.3% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 3.0% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 0.0% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 0.3% for ineligible clients.

For the third survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.8% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 2.2% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 0.3% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 0.3% for ineligible clients.

For the fourth survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.7% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 3.4% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 0.0% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 0.3% for ineligible clients.

^aA "valid" SNAP benefit receipt status is one in which all participation and eligibility (i.e. income) questions have valid responses.

^bEligibility was determined based on the previous month's income alone.

Key findings include:

- 63.7% of SNAP benefit recipients and 81.3% of apparently eligible nonparticipants said that they or adults in the household reduced meal sizes or skipped meals entirely some months or every month in the past year because there

was not enough money for food; the comparable percentage for apparently ineligible clients was 27.7%.

- 73.8% of SNAP benefit recipients and 83.5% of apparently eligible nonparticipants said they ate less than they should because they lacked money to buy food; the comparable figure for the apparently ineligible respondents was n.p..
- 48.6% of SNAP benefit recipients and 33.2% of apparently eligible nonparticipants said that they or adults in the household did not eat for a whole day because there was not enough money for food; the comparable percentage for apparently ineligible clients was n.p..

6.4 INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN

In addition to the six questions shown in Tables 6.2.1 and 6.3.1, clients were asked three additional questions about their children's skipping of meals, being hungry, and not eating enough.

TABLE 6.4.1

INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
How often during the previous 12 months clients' child/children was/were not eating enough because they just couldn't afford enough food				
Often	2.7%	n.p.	N.A.	4.3%
Sometimes	43.0%	n.p.	N.A.	39.9%
Never	54.3%	n.p.	N.A.	55.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Clients whose child/children ever skipped meals because there wasn't enough money for food during the previous 12 months				
Yes	21.0%	n.p.	N.A.	19.4%
No	79.0%	n.p.	N.A.	80.6%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Clients whose child/children was/were hungry at least once during the previous 12 months, but couldn't afford more food				
Yes	41.1%	n.p.	N.A.	38.3%
No	58.9%	n.p.	N.A.	61.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	60	7	N.A.	67

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 3, 6b, 49, 50, and 51 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.



For the first survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.8% for all clients.


For the second survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 4.6% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.2% for all clients.

For the third survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.9% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 2.7% for all clients.

Among all clients with children, 4.3% stated that, during the previous 12 months, their children were *often* not eating enough because they just could not afford enough food. Another 39.9% of the clients experienced such a situation *sometimes* during the previous 12 months.

- 19.4% of the clients with children said that their children skipped meals because there was not enough money for food during the previous 12 months.
- 38.3% of the clients with children said that their children were hungry at least once during the previous 12 months, but they could not afford more food.





Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p" or "N.A". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

Table 6.4.2 examines the associations between the responses presented in Table 6.4.1 and participation and eligibility in SNAP.

TABLE 6.4.2

INDICATORS OF FOOD INSECURITY AMONG HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFIT RECEIPT

	All Client Households with Valid SNAP Benefit Receipt Status ^b	SNAP Benefit Receipt Status of Households		
		Receiving SNAP Benefits	Apparently Eligible, Not Receiving	Apparently Ineligible Because of Income, Not Receiving ^a
How often during the previous 12 months clients' child/children was/were not eating enough because they just couldn't afford enough food				
Often	4.4%	6.2%	n.p.	n.p.
Sometimes	40.5%	35.8%	n.p.	n.p.
Never	55.1%	57.9%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	61	37	19	5
Clients whose child/children ever skipped meals because there wasn't enough money for food during the previous 12 months				
Yes	19.7%	19.6%	n.p.	n.p.
No	80.3%	80.4%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	60	37	18	5
Clients whose child/children was/were hungry at least once during the previous 12 months, but couldn't afford more food				
Yes	38.8%	35.6%	n.p.	n.p.
No	61.2%	64.4%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	61	38	18	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 29, 31, 49, 50, and 51 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the

Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the first survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 42.6% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 24.9% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 10.3% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 7.3% for ineligible clients.

For the second survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 44.0% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 25.4% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 11.3% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 7.3% for ineligible clients.

For the third survey indicator of food security in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 43.0% for all clients with valid SNAP benefit receipt status, 24.8% for clients receiving SNAP benefits, 10.9% for eligible, not receiving clients, and 7.3% for ineligible clients.

^aEligibility was determined based on the previous month's income alone.

^bA "valid" SNAP benefit receipt status is one in which all participation and eligibility (i.e. income) questions have valid responses.

Several findings include:

- Among all clients with children that participated in SNAP, 6.2% stated that, during the previous 12 months, their children were *often* not eating enough because they just could not afford enough food. This compares to n.p. of eligible nonparticipants and n.p. of ineligible nonparticipants.
- Among all clients with children that participated in SNAP with children, 19.6% said that their children skipped meals because there was not enough money for food during the previous 12 months. This compares to n.p. of eligible nonparticipants and n.p. of ineligible nonparticipants.
- Among all clients with children that participated in SNAP with children, 35.6% said that their children were hungry at least once during the previous 12 months, but they could not afford more food. This compares to n.p. of eligible nonparticipants and n.p. of ineligible nonparticipants.

6.5 CHOICE BETWEEN FOOD AND NECESSITIES

Clients were asked whether their families had to choose between food and necessities during the 12-month period prior to the interview. Table 6.5.1 summarizes the results.

TABLE 6.5.1
CHOICE BETWEEN FOOD AND NECESSITIES

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
In the previous 12 months, clients or their family who ever had to choose at least once between				
Paying for food and paying for utilities or heating fuel	63.2%	n.p.	N.A.	60.8%
Paying for food and paying for rent or mortgage	48.3%	n.p.	N.A.	46.9%
Paying for food and paying for medicine or medical care	40.2%	n.p.	N.A.	41.4%
Paying for food and paying for transportation	39.7%	n.p.	N.A.	42.0%
Paying for food and paying for gas for a car	46.8%	n.p.	N.A.	46.8%
Households with all five of the situations	17.3%	n.p.	N.A.	18.2%
Households with four of the five situations	17.9%	n.p.	N.A.	16.4%
Households with three of the five situations	13.0%	n.p.	N.A.	11.9%
Households with two of the five situations	9.6%	n.p.	N.A.	9.8%
Households with just one of the situations	18.2%	n.p.	N.A.	20.4%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 52 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For choosing between food and utilities, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 5.0% for pantry clients, 27.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 7.4% for all clients.

For choosing between food and rent (mortgage), missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 5.0% for pantry clients, 27.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 7.4% for all clients.

For choosing between food and medical care, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.4% for pantry clients, 17.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.9% for all clients.

For choosing between food and transportation, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 4.0% for pantry clients, 27.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 6.6% for all clients.

For choosing between food and gas for a car, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 5.0% for pantry clients, 27.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 7.4% for all clients.

For number of situations, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.1% for pantry clients, 17.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.6% for all clients.

As shown in Table 6.5.1, among pantry client households, 63.2% had to choose between paying for food and paying for utilities or heating fuel; 48.3% had to choose between food and rent or mortgage; 40.2% had to choose between food and medicine or medical care; 39.7% had to choose between food and paying for transportation; and 46.8% had to choose between food and paying for gas for a car. Results for kitchen and shelter client households are:

- Among kitchen client households, n.p. had to choose between paying for food and paying for utilities or heating fuel; n.p. between food and rent or mortgage; n.p. between food and medicine or medical care; n.p. between food and paying for transportation; and n.p. between food and gas for a car.
- Among shelter client households, N.A. had to choose between paying for food and paying for utilities or heating; N.A. between food and rent or mortgage; N.A. between food and medicine or medical care; N.A. between food and paying for transportation; and N.A. between food and gas for a car.

The responses to the question of whether the household had to make choices between buying food and spending money on other necessities provides another indicator of the constraints that households face. It is therefore of interest to examine how these responses are correlated with selected measures of household well-being such as food security. Table 6.5.2 presents the results.

TABLE 6.5.2
HOUSEHOLD TRADE-OFFS, BY FOOD SECURITY STATUS

	All Client Households	Food Security Status of Client Households		
		Food Secure	Food Insecure with Low Food Security	Food Insecure with Very Low Food Security
Choose between food and utilities or heating fuel				
Yes	60.9%	n.p.	60.4%	74.0%
No	39.1%	n.p.	39.6%	26.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	111	22	44	45
Choose between food and rent or mortgage				
Yes	46.9%	n.p.	44.8%	62.1%
No	53.1%	n.p.	55.2%	37.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	111	22	44	45
Choose between food and medical care				
Yes	41.4%	n.p.	42.1%	50.4%
No	58.6%	n.p.	57.9%	49.6%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	114	23	44	47
Choose between food and paying for transportation				
Yes	42.0%	n.p.	31.4%	60.9%
No	58.0%	n.p.	68.6%	39.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	112	22	44	46

Choose between food and paying for gas for a car				
Yes	46.8%	n.p.	47.3%	60.4%
No	53.2%	n.p.	52.7%	39.6%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	111	22	44	45

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Questions 52, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For choosing between food and utilities, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.9% for all clients, 2.9% for households that are food secure, 1.4% for households that are food insecure with low security, and 2.0% for households that are food insecure with very low security.

For choosing between food and rent (mortgage), missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.9% for all clients, 2.9% for households that are food secure, 1.4% for households that are food insecure with low security, and 2.0% for households that are food insecure with very low security.

For choosing between food and medical care, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.8% for all clients, 2.8% for households that are food secure, 0.6% for households that are food insecure with low security, and 0.3% for households that are food insecure with very low security.

For choosing between food and transportation, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.9% for all clients, 2.9% for households that are food secure, 1.4% for households that are food insecure with low security, and 1.2% for households that are food insecure with very low security.

For choosing between food and gas for a car, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.9% for all clients, 2.9% for households that are food secure, 1.4% for households that are food insecure with low security, and 2.0% for households that are food insecure with very low security.

Table 6.5.2 describes the proportions of households that face direct trade-offs among necessities for subgroups defined by food security status. Specific results include:

- n.p. of the households categorized as food secure, 42.1% of those categorized as having low food security, and 50.4% of those categorized as having very low food security had to choose between food and medical care during the past year.
- n.p. of the households categorized as food secure, 60.4% of those categorized as having low food security, and 74.0% of those categorized as having very low food security had to choose between food and utilities (or heating fuel) during the past year.

- n.p. of the households categorized as food secure, 44.8% of those categorized as having low food security, and 62.1% of those categorized as having very low food security had to choose between food and rent (or mortgage) during the past year.
- n.p. of the households categorized as food secure, 31.4% of those categorized as having low food security, and 60.9% of those categorized as having very low food security had to choose between food and transportation during the past year.
- n.p. of the households categorized as food secure, 47.3% of those categorized as having low food security, and 60.4% of those categorized as having very low food security had to choose between food and gas for a car during the past year.

There is also a notable association between household structure and reporting direct trade-offs between necessities (Table 6.5.3).

TABLE 6.5.3
HOUSEHOLD TRADE-OFFS, BY HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE

	All Households	Households with Seniors	Households with Children, No Seniors	One-Person Households with Neither Children Nor Seniors	Households with Two or More People but with Neither Children Nor Seniors
Choose between food and utilities or heating fuel					
Yes	60.8%	n.p.	68.3%	n.p.	n.p.
No	39.2%	n.p.	31.7%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	112	14	58	23	17
Choose between food and rent or mortgage					
Yes	46.9%	n.p.	45.0%	n.p.	n.p.
No	53.1%	n.p.	55.0%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	112	14	58	23	17
Choose between food and medical care					
Yes	41.4%	n.p.	42.2%	n.p.	n.p.
No	58.6%	n.p.	57.8%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	115	14	59	25	17
Choose between food and paying for transportation					
Yes	42.0%	n.p.	41.3%	n.p.	n.p.
No	58.0%	n.p.	58.7%	n.p.	n.p.

	All Households	Households with Seniors	Households with Children, No Seniors	One-Person Households with Neither Children Nor Seniors	Households with Two or More People but with Neither Children Nor Seniors
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	113	14	58	24	17
Choose between food and paying for gas for a car					
Yes	46.8%	n.p.	50.2%	n.p.	n.p.
No	53.2%	n.p.	49.8%	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	112	14	58	23	17

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Questions 52, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For choosing between food and utilities, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.2% for all households, 1.2% for households with seniors, 1.7% for households with seniors and no children, 3.5% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, and 0.9% for households with two or more people but neither seniors nor children.

For choosing between food and rent (mortgage), missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.2% for all households, 1.2% for households with seniors, 1.7% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, 3.5% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, and 0.9% for households with two or more people but neither seniors nor children.

For choosing between food and medical care, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.2% for all households, 1.2% for households with seniors, 1.0% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, 1.8% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, and 0.9% for households with two or more people but neither seniors nor children.

For choosing between food and transportation, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.2% for all households, 1.2% for households with seniors, 1.7% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, 2.7% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, and 0.9% for households with two or more people but neither seniors nor children.

For choosing between food and gas for a car, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.2% for all households, 1.2% for households with seniors, 1.7% for one-person households with neither

seniors nor children, 3.5% for one-person households with neither seniors nor children, and 0.9% for households with two or more people but neither seniors nor children.

Key findings include:

- n.p. of households with seniors and 42.2% of households with children and no seniors reported making trade-offs between food and medical care, compared with 41.4% for the whole population.
- The comparable percentages for trade-offs between food and utilities were n.p. for households with seniors and 68.3% for households with children but no seniors, compared with 60.8% for the whole population.

For the choice between food and rent (or mortgage payments), 45.0% of households with children but no seniors had to choose, compared with only n.p. of households with seniors.

7. CLIENTS: USE OF FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Given the high levels of need evidenced by many clients in the FA network, it is important to assess whether the clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County are receiving all of the governmental nutrition assistance for which they are eligible. In this chapter, we begin by examining client participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (formerly the Food Stamp Program), since it is the largest and most widely available government nutrition assistance program. Levels of participation and reasons for non-participation are both examined. A subsequent section examines participation in other government nutrition programs.

7.1 USE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Clients were asked a series of questions relating to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Table 7.1.1 summarizes the findings.

TABLE 7.1.1
USE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Participation in SNAP	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Client or anyone in the household had ever applied for SNAP benefits	81.5%	n.p.	N.A.	83.4%
Client or anyone in the household currently receiving SNAP benefits	55.0%	n.p.	N.A.	56.8%
Client or anyone in the household currently not receiving but received SNAP benefits during the previous 12 months	6.1%	n.p.	N.A.	8.0%
Client or anyone in the household had applied for but had not received SNAP benefits during the previous 12 months	19.8%	n.p.	N.A.	18.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

Participation in SNAP	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Number of weeks clients or their households have currently been receiving SNAP benefits (for those who are receiving)				
Less than 2 weeks	0.7%	n.p.	N.A.	0.6%
2-4 weeks	10.2%	n.p.	N.A.	8.8%
5-12 weeks	1.9%	n.p.	N.A.	1.7%
13-51 weeks	21.0%	n.p.	N.A.	18.4%
1-2 years (52-103 weeks)	15.9%	n.p.	N.A.	18.2%
2-4 years (104-207 weeks)	12.8%	n.p.	N.A.	13.4%
4 years or more	37.5%	n.p.	N.A.	39.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Average number of weeks clients or their households have currently been receiving SNAP benefits ^a	229.7	n.p.	N.A.	235.7
Median number of weeks clients or their households have currently been receiving SNAP benefits ^a	104	n.p.	N.A.	104
Number of weeks during which SNAP benefits usually last ^a				
1 week or less	17.9%	n.p.	N.A.	17.9%
2 weeks	47.3%	n.p.	N.A.	46.3%
3 weeks	26.0%	n.p.	N.A.	27.1%
4 weeks	8.8%	n.p.	N.A.	8.4%
More than 4 weeks	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Average number of weeks during the month over which SNAP benefits usually last	2.4	n.p.	N.A.	2.5
Median number of weeks during the month over which SNAP benefits usually last	2	n.p.	N.A.	2
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	52	15	N.A.	67

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 30, 31, 32, 34, and 35 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

The second, third, and fourth rows of the first panel do not add up exactly to the first row due to varying item nonresponses to the question involved.

For the table section describing the number of weeks currently receiving SNAP benefits, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 39.5% for pantry clients, 31.1% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 38.4% for all clients.


For the table section describing the number of weeks SNAP benefits usually last, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 34.5% for pantry clients, 40.1% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 35.2% for all clients.

^a Most SNAP households (67 percent) receive less than the maximum SNAP benefit with the expectation that they can contribute some of their own funds for food purchases. In other words, program benefits are not designed to last the full month in all households.

Overall, 83.4% of the clients have ever applied for, and 56.8% are currently receiving, SNAP benefits.²² More information includes:

- 52.4% of the clients who are receiving SNAP benefits have been receiving them for more than two years.
- For 91.3% of the clients who are receiving SNAP benefits, the benefits last for three weeks or less. For 64.2%, they last for two weeks or less.
- On average, SNAP benefits last for 2.5 weeks.

²² Caution should be taken in comparing these estimates because one asks whether the respondent has *ever* applied for SNAP benefits, while the other asks whether the respondent is *currently* receiving benefits.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

SNAP use is known to differ according to household composition. Table 7.1.2 examines the relationship between household structure and the characteristics presented in Table 7.1.1

TABLE 7.1.2

USE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM,
BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN

Participation in SNAP	Elderly Clients at Program Sites	Households with Seniors	Households with Children Younger than 18	Households with Children Ages 0-5
Client or anyone in the household had ever applied for SNAP benefits	n.p.	n.p.	89.0%	89.8%
Client or anyone in the household currently receiving SNAP benefits	n.p.	n.p.	61.3%	70.8%
Client or anyone in the household currently not receiving but received SNAP benefits during the previous 12 months	n.p.	n.p.	9.4%	7.2%
Client or anyone in the household had applied for but had not received SNAP benefits during the previous 12 months	n.p.	n.p.	18.4%	11.7%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	11	16	67	32
Number of weeks clients or their households have currently been receiving SNAP benefits (for those who are receiving)				
Less than 2 weeks	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
2-4 weeks	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
5-12 weeks	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
13-51 weeks	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
1-2 years (52-103 weeks)	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
2-4 years (104-207 weeks)	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
4 years or more	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Average number of weeks clients or their households have currently been receiving SNAP benefits	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Median number of weeks clients or their households have currently been receiving SNAP benefits	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Number of weeks during which SNAP benefits usually last ^a				

Participation in SNAP	Elderly Clients at Program Sites	Households with Seniors	Households with Children Younger than 18	Households with Children Ages 0-5
1 week or less	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
2 weeks	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
3 weeks	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
4 weeks	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
More than 4 weeks	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
TOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Average number of weeks during the month over which SNAP benefits usually last ^a	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Median number of weeks during the month over which SNAP benefits usually last ^a	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	3	7	7	7

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 3, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7, 30, 31, 32, 34, and 35 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

The second, third, and fourth rows of the first panel do not add up exactly to the first row due to varying item nonresponses to the question involved.

For the table section describing the number of weeks currently receiving SNAP benefits, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 77.6% for elderly clients at program sites, 50.9% for households with seniors, 36.4% for households with children younger than 18, and 34.6% for households with children ages 0-5.

For the table section describing the number of weeks SNAP benefits usually last, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 31.3% for elderly clients at program sites, 20.6% for households with seniors, 33.2% for households with children younger than 18, and 21.6% for households with children ages 0-5.

Key findings include:

- n.p. of clients living in households with seniors have ever applied to SNAP. This compares to 89.0% of households with children younger than 18 and 89.8% of households with children ages 0 to 5.
- n.p. of clients living in households with seniors are currently receiving SNAP benefits. This compares to 61.3% of households with children younger than 18 and 70.8% of households with children ages 0 to 5.

- The median number of weeks during the month over which SNAP benefits usually last is n.p. weeks for clients in households with seniors, n.p. weeks for clients in households with children younger than 18, and n.p. weeks for clients in households with children ages 0 to 5.

7.2 REASONS WHY CLIENTS NEVER APPLIED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS

Clients who had not applied for SNAP benefits were asked why they or their households never applied for SNAP benefits. Table 7.2.1 shows the results.

TABLE 7.2.1

REASONS WHY CLIENTS NEVER APPLIED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS

Reasons Why Clients or Their Households Never Applied for SNAP Benefits ^a	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Ineligibility^b				
Don't think eligible because of income or assets				
All clients	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Clients with income 130% of the federal poverty level or lower	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Clients with income higher than 130% of the federal poverty level	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Unknown	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Don't think eligible because of citizenship status	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Eligible for only a low benefit amount	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL^c	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Inconvenience				
Don't know where to go or who to contact to apply	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Hard to get to the SNAP office	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Application process is too long and complicated	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Questions are too personal	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SNAP office staff are disrespectful	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SNAP office is unpleasant or in unsafe area	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SNAP office is not open when I am available	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SNAP office does not offer services in my language	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Didn't want to be fingerprinted	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Nowhere to redeem benefits near me	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.

Reasons Why Clients or Their Households Never Applied for SNAP Benefits ^a	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
No need				
No need for benefit	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Others need benefits more	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Social stigma				
Feel embarrassed applying for benefits	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Family or friends do not approve of my receiving benefits	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Dislike relying on the government for assistance	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Feel embarrassed using benefits	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Other				
Planning to apply, but not yet applied	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Other ^d	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	23	2	N.A.	25

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 36 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.0% for all clients.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bSee Appendix B for SNAP eligibility criteria.

^cThe subtotal in this table indicates the percentage of people who provided one or more component items as their responses; thus, it may differ from the sum of component items.

^dThis includes working, having no mailing address, and being in a temporary living situation.


Reasons for not having applied for SNAP benefits include:

- Overall, n.p. of the clients who had not applied for SNAP benefits did not do so because they believe they are not eligible or eligible for only a low benefit amount; n.p. because it is too much hassle; n.p. either because there is no need or because they think others would need the benefits more; and n.p. because they associate a social stigma with SNAP benefits.

- n.p. of the clients indicated income or assets above the eligible level as a reason for having not applied for SNAP benefits.
- That n.p. was broken down into two categories: those who had an income that is at or below 130% of the federal poverty level (n.p.), and those who had an income that is higher than 130% of the federal poverty level (n.p.).^{23,24}

²³ Generalizing this result requires caution, as the income data collected through our client survey were not validated.

²⁴ Broadly speaking, a household usually meets the income eligibility requirements for SNAP if its gross income is less than 130% of the poverty level. However, it was not possible during the survey to collect all the detailed data necessary to assess eligibility. See Appendix B for the eligibility criteria.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

Given the importance of understanding why some households that need SNAP assistance fail to get it, Table 7.2.2 examines the relationship between household structure and factors associated with not applying for SNAP benefits.

TABLE 7.2.2

REASONS WHY CLIENTS NEVER APPLIED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE
PROGRAM BENEFITS, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN

Reasons Why Respondents or Their Households Never Applied for SNAP Benefits ^a	Elderly Clients at Program Sites	Households with Seniors	Households with Children Younger than 18	Households with Children Ages 0-5
Factors associated with eligibility				
Don't think eligible because of income or assets				
All	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Income 130% of federal poverty level or lower	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Income higher than 130% of federal poverty level	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Unknown	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Don't think eligible because of citizenship status	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Eligible for only a low benefit amount	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL ^b	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Factors associated with program operation				
Don't know where to go or whom to contact to apply	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Hard to get to the SNAP office	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Application process is too long and complicated	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Questions are too personal	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SNAP office staff are disrespectful	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SNAP office is unpleasant or in unsafe area	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SNAP office is not open when I am available	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SNAP office does not offer services in my language	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Didn't want to be fingerprinted	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Nowhere to redeem benefits near me	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.

Reasons Why Respondents or Their Households Never Applied for SNAP Benefits ^a	Elderly Clients at Program Sites	Households with Seniors	Households with Children Younger than 18	Households with Children Ages 0-5
Factors associated with financial needs				
No need for benefit	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Others need benefits more	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Factors associated with social stigma				
Feel embarrassed applying for benefits	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Family or friends do not approve of my receiving benefits	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Dislike relying on the government for assistance	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Feel embarrassed using benefits	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Other factors				
Planning to apply, but not yet	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Other	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	4	5	13	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 3, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7, and 36 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

In calculating percentages and sample sizes, we excluded item nonresponses to all variables involved.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for elderly clients at program sites, 0.0% for households with seniors, 8.0% for households with children younger than 18, and 19.1% for households with children ages 0-5.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bThe subtotal indicates the percentage of people who provided one or more component items as their responses; thus it may differ from the sum of component items. See Appendix B for SNAP eligibility criteria.

Key findings include:

- n.p. of households with young children cited factors associated with program operation for not applying, compared with n.p. of households with seniors.
- n.p. of households with seniors, compared with n.p. of households with young children indicated a reason associated with their financial needs.

7.3 REASONS WHY CLIENTS OR THEIR HOUSEHOLDS ARE NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, FOR THOSE WHO HAVE APPLIED

Clients who have applied but are not currently receiving SNAP benefits were asked why this is so. Results are shown in Table 7.3.1.

TABLE 7.3.1

REASONS WHY CLIENTS OR THEIR HOUSEHOLDS ARE NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, FOR THOSE WHO HAVE APPLIED

Reasons Why Clients or Their Households Are Not Currently Receiving SNAP benefits, for Those Who Have Applied for SNAP Benefits ^a	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Ineligibility				
Ineligible income level	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	59.3%
Change of household makeup	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Time limit for receiving the help ran out	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	6.9%
Citizenship status	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL ^b	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	66.2%
Inconvenience				
Too much hassle	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	16.1%
Hard to get to SNAP office	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	1.4%
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	17.5%
No need				
No need for benefits	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	1.8%
Others need benefits more	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	1.4%
Need is only temporary	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	9.7%
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	12.8%
Other				
Other reasons ^c	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	9.9%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	26	7	N.A.	33

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 33 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.4% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 2.1% for all clients.


^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bThe subtotal in this table indicates the percentage of people who provided one or more component items as their responses; thus it may differ from the sum of component items.

^cThis includes “waiting” and “in progress.”

Several main findings include:

- Overall, 66.2% of the clients say that they are not receiving SNAP benefits because they believe they are not eligible.
- 17.5% are not receiving SNAP benefits because it is too much hassle.
- 12.8% are not receiving SNAP benefits either because there is no need or because they think others would need the benefits more, or the need is only temporary.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

Table 7.3.2 examines the relationship between household structure and factors associated with not receiving SNAP benefits, among those who applied. It also presents a summary of the previous month's household income levels for those clients who reported higher income levels as the reason for non-receipt.

TABLE 7.3.2

REASONS THAT RESPONDENTS OR THEIR HOUSEHOLDS DO NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVE
SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, FOR THOSE WHO HAVE APPLIED,
BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN

Reasons That Clients or Their Households Do Not Currently Receive SNAP Benefits, Among the Ones Who Have Applied for SNAP Benefits ^a	Elderly Clients at Program Sites	Households with Seniors	Households with Children Younger than 18	Households with Children Ages 0-5
Factors associated with eligibility				
Ineligible income level				
All	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Income 130% of federal poverty level or lower	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Income higher than 130% of federal poverty level	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Unknown	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Change of household makeup	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Time limit receiving for the help ran out	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Citizenship status	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL ^b	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Factors associated with program operation				
Too much hassle	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Hard to get to SNAP office	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Factors Associated with Need				
No need for benefits	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Others need benefits more	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Need is only temporary	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SUBTOTAL	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Other Factors				
Other reasons ^c	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	4	4	14	4

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 3, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7, and 33 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.0% for elderly clients, 6.0% for households with seniors, 3.1% for households with children younger than 18, and 0.0% for households with children 0-5.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bThe subtotal indicates the percentage of people who provided one or more component items as their responses; thus, it may differ from the sum of component items.

^cThis includes "waiting" and "in progress."

We find:

- n.p. of households with children mentioned one or more reasons related to eligibility, compared with n.p. of households with seniors.
- n.p. of elderly clients and n.p. of households with elderly members mentioned factors associated with program operations, compared to n.p. of households with children younger than 18 and n.p. of households with children ages 0 to 5.
- n.p. of elderly clients and n.p. of households with elderly members mentioned factors associated with the need for benefits, compared to n.p. of households with children younger than 18 and n.p. of households with children ages 0 to 5.

Tables 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 show that some clients indicated a higher-than-required income level as a reason they were not currently receiving SNAP benefits. This percentage is 59.3% among all clients. In Table 7.3.3, those clients are further broken down into two categories based on the information about their previous month's household income: those whose income is 130% of the federal poverty level or lower (38.7%); and those whose income is higher than 130% of the federal poverty level (19.4%).

TABLE 7.3.3

REPORTED INCOME LEVELS OF CLIENTS WHO INDICATED INELIGIBLE INCOME AS A REASON FOR NOT RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS

Reported Income Levels of Clients Who Indicated Ineligible Income as a Reason for Not Receiving SNAP Benefits	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Ineligible income level	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	59.3%
Income 130% of the federal poverty level or lower	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	38.7%
Income higher than 130% of the federal poverty level	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	19.4%
Income unknown	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	26	7	N.A.	33

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 33 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 4.4% for pantry clients, 44.4% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 8.7% for all clients.

In Table 7.3.4 by elderly and child status, we find that the percentage of clients that indicated a higher income level as a reason they were not currently receiving SNAP benefits whose income is 130% of the federal poverty level or lower is n.p. for households with seniors, n.p. for households with children younger than 18, and n.p. for households with young children.

TABLE 7.3.4

REPORTED INCOME LEVELS OF CLIENTS WHO INDICATED INELIGIBLE INCOME
AS A REASON FOR NOT RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
BENEFITS, BY ELDERLY AND CHILD STATUS

Reported Income Levels of Clients Who Indicated Ineligible Income as a Reason for Not Receiving SNAP Benefits	Elderly Clients at Program Sites	Households with Seniors	Households with Children Younger than 18	Households with Children Ages 0-5
Ineligible income level	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Income 130% of the federal poverty level or lower	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Income higher than 130% of the federal poverty level	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
Income unknown	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	4	4	14	4

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 33 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.0% for elderly clients at program sites, 6.0% for households with seniors, 0.0% for households with children younger than 18, and 0.0% for households with children ages 0-5.

7.4 USE OF OTHER PROGRAMS

Clients also reported on other federal nutrition or child care programs they use. Table 7.4.1 shows the results.

TABLE 7.4.1
USE OF OTHER PROGRAMS

Other Program(s) Clients or Their Families Currently Participate In ^a	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Government Mass Distribution Program or TEFAP (cheese, butter, etc., not from pantries) ^b	39.4%	n.p.	N.A.	39.8%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125
Senior nutrition sites, such as senior centers that serve lunch	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Home-delivered meals or meals-on-wheels (usually for seniors or people with disabilities)	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
Senior brown-bag programs that give out groceries and produce	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Households with at least one senior member age 65 or older	13	3	N.A.	16
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	n.p.	n.p.	N.A.	n.p.
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Households with at least one child ages 0-3 years	19	2	N.A.	21
Child day care	20.0%	n.p.	N.A.	19.1%
Government assistance for child day care among those using child day care	83.3%	N.A.	N.A.	83.3%
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Households with at least one child ages 0-5 years	30	2	N.A.	32
School lunch program	60.9%	n.p.	N.A.	63.6%
School breakfast program	54.4%	n.p.	N.A.	57.6%
After-school snack program	2.8%	n.p.	N.A.	2.6%
Child care food program, such as meals at subsidized child care centers	4.1%	n.p.	N.A.	3.8%
Summer food program	12.4%	n.p.	N.A.	14.7%
Backpack weekend food program	3.0%	n.p.	N.A.	2.8%
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Households with at least one child younger than age 18	60	7	N.A.	67

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 7a, 8, 39, and 41 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bThe percentages of clients receiving food from these programs may be underestimated, as clients may not be aware of the exact source of the food they receive.

Among all client households, 39.8% participate in Government Mass Distribution programs or TEFAP. Participation in other programs is as follows:

- Among the households with at least one senior member age 65 or older, n.p. use senior nutrition sites; n.p. use home-delivered meals or meals-on-wheels; and n.p. participate in senior brown-bag programs.
- Among the households with at least one child younger than age 18, 63.6% and 57.6% benefit from the school lunch and the school breakfast program, respectively; 2.6% use an after-school snack program; 3.8% use a child care food program; and 14.7% participate in the summer food program, which provides free, nutritious meals and snacks to children throughout the summer months when they are out of school.

Clients with children who did not participate in the summer food program were asked the reason that did not participate. Table 7.4.2 shows the results.

TABLE 7.4.2

NONPARTICIPATION IN THE SUMMER FOOD PROGRAM

Reason Children in Client Households Did Not Participate ^a	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Didn't know about it	49.1%	n.p.	N.A.	47.7%
No site or program near client	4.8%	n.p.	N.A.	4.9%
No transportation	3.6%	n.p.	N.A.	6.2%
No need	26.1%	n.p.	N.A.	25.4%
Enrolled in another program	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Do not qualify	2.8%	n.p.	N.A.	2.7%
Other	13.6%	n.p.	N.A.	13.1%

Reason Children in Client Households Did Not Participate ^a	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Households with at least one child younger than age 18 who did not participate in the summer food program	49	5	N.A.	54

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 41 and 41a of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 19.1% for pantry clients, 45.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 20.4% for all clients.

^aMultiple responses were not accepted.

Reasons for not participating in the summer food program include:

- Among all households with at least one child younger than age 18, 47.7% said they did not know about the summer food program, 4.9% said there was no site or program near them, and 6.2% said they did not have transportation.
- Among all households with at least one child younger than age 18, 25.4% said they did not have a need to participate, while 2.7% said they did not qualify for the program.

7.5 GENERAL ASSISTANCE, WELFARE, AND TANF IN THE PREVIOUS TWO YEARS

Clients were asked whether they received General Assistance, welfare, or TANF in the previous two years. Table 7.5.1 presents the results.

TABLE 7.5.1

GENERAL ASSISTANCE, WELFARE, AND TANF IN THE PREVIOUS TWO YEARS

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Clients who received General Assistance, welfare, or TANF during the past two years				
Yes	33.7%	n.p.	N.A.	31.2%
No	66.3%	n.p.	N.A.	68.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 26 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 5.5% for pantry clients, 5.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 5.4% for all clients.

During the previous two years, 31.2% of the clients received general assistance, welfare, or TANF benefits.

7.6 GROCERY SHOPPING PATTERNS

Clients were asked where they do most of their grocery shopping. Results are shown in Table 7.6.1.

TABLE 7.6.1
GROCERY SHOPPING PATTERNS

<i>Where do you do <u>most</u> of your grocery shopping?</i>	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	Adult Clients at All Program Sites
Supermarkets or grocery stores	71.6%	n.p.	N.A.	72.1%
Discount stores (e.g., Wal-Mart, Target, K-Mart)	19.1%	n.p.	N.A.	19.7%
Warehouse clubs (e.g., Price Club, Costco, Pace, Sam's Club, BJ's)	4.7%	n.p.	N.A.	4.1%
Convenience stores (e.g., 7-11, Quickshop, Wawa)	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Ethnic food stores (e.g., bodegas, Asian food markets, or Caribbean markets)	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Farmer's market	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Dollar stores	0.2%	n.p.	N.A.	0.2%
Some other place	0.9%	n.p.	N.A.	0.8%
Don't know because someone else in family shops	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
Don't buy groceries, free food only	3.5%	n.p.	N.A.	3.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 38 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 4.8% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.2% for all clients.

Among all clients, 72.1% shop mostly at supermarkets or grocery stores. Information about other places where some of the clients do most their grocery shopping follows:

- 19.7% of the clients shop mostly at discount stores such as Wal-Mart, Target, or K-Mart.
- 0.2% of the clients use dollar stores for most of their grocery shopping.
- 0.0% of the clients use convenience stores for most of their grocery shopping.
- 3.1% of the clients do not buy groceries. They rely only on free food.

8. CLIENTS: HEALTH STATUS

Health status can be an important determinant of overall household circumstances and need. Therefore, the survey asked clients for information on the health of both themselves and other household members. The responses to these questions are presented below. In addition, data are presented on clients' access to health insurance and health care.

8.1 HEALTH STATUS

Clients were asked to indicate their health status, then to indicate whether anyone else in their household was in poor health. Table 8.1.1 summarizes the results.

TABLE 8.1.1
HEALTH STATUS

	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	Adult Clients at All Program Sites
Clients who indicated that their health was...				
Excellent	8.2%	n.p.	N.A.	7.3%
Very good	9.0%	n.p.	N.A.	9.5%
Good	33.4%	n.p.	N.A.	31.3%
Fair	25.5%	n.p.	N.A.	26.8%
Poor	23.9%	n.p.	N.A.	25.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Clients who indicated that someone else in the household was in poor health				
Yes	17.1%	n.p.	N.A.	18.9%
No	58.9%	n.p.	N.A.	54.8%
Live alone	24.0%	n.p.	N.A.	26.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Households with at least one member reported to be in poor health	38.3%	n.p.	N.A.	40.7%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 20 and 21 of the client survey.


NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For clients reporting about their own health, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.9% for all clients.

For clients reporting about the health of other household members, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.0% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 1.8% for all clients.

Overall, 25.1% of the clients at all program sites are in poor health, and 40.7% of the client households have one or more members in poor health. More details follow:

- Among pantry clients, 8.2% were in excellent health, 9.0% in very good health, 33.4% in good health, 25.5% in fair health, and 23.9% in poor health.
- Among kitchen clients, n.p. were in excellent health, n.p. in very good health, n.p. in good health, n.p. in fair health, and n.p. in poor health.
- Among shelter clients, N.A. were in excellent health, N.A. in very good health, N.A. in good health, N.A. in fair health, and N.A. in poor health
- 38.3% of the pantry client households had at least one person in poor health.
- n.p. of the kitchen client households had at least one person in poor health.
- N.A. of the shelter client households had at least one person in poor health.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

8.2 HEALTH INSURANCE AND ACCESS TO MEDICAL CARE

Clients were asked whether they or anyone in their households had various kinds of health insurance. Clients also indicated whether they had unpaid medical or hospital bills and whether they had been refused medical care during the previous 12 months. Results are provided in Table 8.2.1.

TABLE 8.2.1
HEALTH INSURANCE AND ACCESS TO MEDICAL CARE

	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	Adult Clients at All Program Sites
Client or his or her family with following types of health insurance ^a				
Medicare ^b	28.1%	n.p.	N.A.	27.4%
State Medical Assistance Program or Medicaid	49.8%	n.p.	N.A.	48.3%
State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)	8.0%	n.p.	N.A.	10.1%
Veterans Administration (VA) benefits	2.9%	n.p.	N.A.	2.8%
Private health insurance	16.3%	n.p.	N.A.	15.0%
Other health insurance ^c	3.1%	n.p.	N.A.	2.7%
No insurance	19.2%	n.p.	N.A.	21.6%
Clients who had unpaid medical or hospital bills				
Yes	59.3%	n.p.	N.A.	60.2%
No	40.7%	n.p.	N.A.	39.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Clients who had been refused medical care because they could not pay or because they had a Medicaid or Medical Assistance card during the previous 12 months				
Yes	17.4%	n.p.	N.A.	16.9%
No	76.8%	n.p.	N.A.	77.8%
Not refused care, but avoid providers who don't accept medical assistance	3.2%	n.p.	N.A.	2.9%
Not refused care, but finding providers that accept medical assistance is a problem	2.6%	n.p.	N.A.	2.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%

	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	Adult Clients at All Program Sites
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 22a-f, 23, and 24 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the survey item addressing types of health insurance, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for pantry clients, 0.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.9% for all clients.

For the survey item addressing unpaid medical bills, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 1.1% for pantry clients, 18.8% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.0% for all clients.

For the survey item addressing refused medical care, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.1% for pantry clients, 19.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.0% for all clients.


^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bAt the national level, the percentage of people who reported having Medicare coverage is substantially larger than what appears to be appropriate considering the percentage of households with seniors. One possible explanation for the discrepancy is widespread confusion between Medicare and Medicaid programs.

^cThis category includes government retirement benefits and military health system (TRICARE).

Findings presented in Table 8.2.1 include:

- 19.2% of the pantry, n.p. of the kitchen, and N.A. of the shelter clients or their households are without health insurance. This accounts for 21.6% of all clients.
- 60.2% of the clients have unpaid medical or hospital bills.
- 16.9% of the clients report that they have been refused medical care because they could not pay or because they had a Medicaid or Medical Assistance card during the previous 12 months.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

Table 8.2.1 showed that 48.3% of all adult clients participate in the State Medical Assistance Program or Medicaid. In Table 8.2.2, we examine how participation in the Medicaid program is associated with income relative to the federal poverty level.

TABLE 8.2.2
INCOME IN 2008, BY MEDICAID PARTICIPATION STATUS

Income in 2008 as Percentage of Federal Poverty Level ^a	All Clients	Client Household Receiving Medicaid Benefits?	
		Yes	No
0% (no income)	7.0%	1.8%	12.3%
1%-50%	27.5%	33.0%	21.9%
51%-75%	17.0%	19.9%	14.1%
76%-100%	18.3%	25.4%	10.9%
101%-130%	10.5%	9.4%	11.7%
SUBTOTAL	80.3%	89.6%	70.7%
131%-150%	4.1%	1.4%	7.0%
151%-185%	10.9%	4.8%	17.2%
186% or higher	4.7%	4.3%	5.1%
SUBTOTAL	19.7%	10.4%	29.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	110	55	55

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 22b and 29 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For all client income levels, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.7% for all clients, 0.9% for households receiving Medicaid benefits, and 5.7% for households not receiving Medicaid benefits.

^aSee Table 5.8.1.1 for the federal poverty levels (and multiply by 12 to obtain annual levels).

Findings presented in Table 8.2.2 include:

- Among the client households receiving Medicaid benefits, 89.6% had income at or below 130% of the federal poverty level in 2008. In comparison, 70.7% of the clients not receiving Medicaid benefits had income at or below that level.

Table 8.2.1 showed that 21.6% of all adult clients do not have health insurance. In Table 8.2.3, we examine the association between income and being insured.

TABLE 8.2.3
INCOME IN 2008, BY UNINSURED STATUS

Income in 2008 as Percentage of Federal Poverty Level ^a	All Clients	Client Household Health Insurance Status	
		Without Health Insurance	With Health Insurance
0% (no income)	6.9%	n.p.	1.9%
1%-50%	27.2%	n.p.	29.3%
51%-75%	17.8%	n.p.	18.8%
76%-100%	18.0%	n.p.	18.2%
101%-130%	10.7%	n.p.	10.2%
SUBTOTAL	80.6%	n.p.	78.5%
131%-150%	4.1%	n.p.	5.0%
151%-185%	10.8%	n.p.	13.3%
186% or higher	4.6%	n.p.	3.2%
SUBTOTAL	19.4%	n.p.	21.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	112	25	87

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 22a-f and 29 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For all client income levels, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.6% for all clients, 3.5% for households without medical insurance, and 3.0% for households receiving medical insurance.

^aSee Table 5.8.1.1 for the federal poverty levels (and multiply by 12 to obtain annual levels).

We find that among client households without health insurance, n.p. had income at or below 130% of the federal poverty level in 2008. In comparison, 78.5% of the clients with health insurance had income at or below that level.

9. CLIENTS: SERVICES RECEIVED AT FOOD PROGRAMS

To better understand how clients use the services of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County, the survey asked questions about the numbers of kitchens and pantries that households used. Questions were also asked concerning the degree of satisfaction that respondents felt with the food services they were receiving from the providers and about what clients would do if they did not have access to the provider from which they were receiving food on the day of the interview. The answers to these questions are examined below.

9.1 NUMBER OF PANTRIES OR KITCHENS USED

Clients were asked how many different pantries or kitchens they had used during the previous month. The results are shown in Table 9.1.1.

TABLE 9.1.1
NUMBER OF DIFFERENT PANTRIES OR KITCHENS USED

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Number of different food pantries clients or their families used during the previous month				
None	n.a.	n.p.	N.A.	4.4%
One or more pantries				
1 pantry	77.6%	n.p.	N.A.	73.1%
2 pantries	9.0%	n.p.	N.A.	9.4%
3 pantries	12.4%	n.p.	N.A.	11.2%
4 pantries	0.9%	n.p.	N.A.	1.9%
5 or more pantries	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	N.A.	95.6%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%

	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Number of different soup kitchens clients or their families used during the previous month				
None	85.7%	n.a.	N.A.	77.5%
One or more kitchens				
1 kitchen	10.9%	n.p.	N.A.	18.9%
2 kitchens	1.8%	n.p.	N.A.	1.9%
3 kitchens	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.2%
4 kitchens	1.5%	n.p.	N.A.	1.4%
5 or more kitchens	0.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	14.3%	n.p.	N.A.	22.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 56 and 57a of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For survey responses about pantries used, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.8% for pantry clients, 12.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.8% for all clients.

For survey responses about kitchens used, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 2.4% for pantry clients, 14.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.8% for all clients.

Among the pantry clients, 77.6% used just one food pantry during the previous month.

More information on the clients' use of the emergency food programs follows:

- n.p. of the kitchen clients used only one soup kitchen, and n.p. also used one or more pantries.
- N.A. of the shelter clients used one or more pantries, and N.A. of the shelter clients also used one or more kitchens.
- 14.3% of the pantry clients also used one or more kitchens.

9.2 SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES AT FOOD PROGRAMS

Clients were asked how satisfied they were with the amount, variety, and overall quality of food provided at the emergency food programs. Clients were also asked how often they were treated with respect by the staff of those programs. Table 9.2.1 summarizes the findings.

TABLE 9.2.1

SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES AT FOOD PROGRAMS

Level of Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Service Provided to Clients or Others in the Household:	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	Adult Clients at All Program Sites
Amount of food provided				
Very satisfied	51.4%	n.p.	N.A.	54.2%
Somewhat satisfied	42.1%	n.p.	N.A.	39.8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	5.7%	n.p.	N.A.	5.2%
Very dissatisfied	0.9%	n.p.	N.A.	0.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Variety of food provided				
Very satisfied	45.0%	n.p.	N.A.	48.0%
Somewhat satisfied	43.6%	n.p.	N.A.	41.6%
Somewhat dissatisfied	9.8%	n.p.	N.A.	8.9%
Very dissatisfied	1.6%	n.p.	N.A.	1.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Overall quality of food provided				
Very satisfied	41.3%	n.p.	N.A.	43.7%
Somewhat satisfied	53.6%	n.p.	N.A.	51.6%
Somewhat dissatisfied	4.2%	n.p.	N.A.	3.9%
Very dissatisfied	0.9%	n.p.	N.A.	0.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%
Frequency with which clients are treated with respect by the staff who distribute food				
All of the time	76.4%	n.p.	N.A.	76.7%
Most of the time	20.7%	n.p.	N.A.	20.7%
Some of the time	0.7%	n.p.	N.A.	0.6%
Never	1.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.9%
Never came before	1.3%	n.p.	N.A.	1.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	n.p.	n.p.	100.0%

Level of Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Service Provided to Clients or Others in the Household:	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a			Adult Clients at All Program Sites
	Pantry	Adult Clients at a Kitchen	Adult Clients at a Shelter	
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 53 and 54 of the client survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the first indicator of client satisfaction in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 5.7% for pantry clients, 9.5% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 6.2% for all clients.


For the second indicator of client satisfaction in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 7.2% for pantry clients, 21.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 8.8% for all clients.

For the third indicator of client satisfaction in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 7.2% for pantry clients, 24.2% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 0.0% for all clients.

For the fourth indicator of client satisfaction in the table, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 3.8% for pantry clients, 12.0% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 4.7% for all clients.

Across all three kinds of emergency food programs, the level of satisfaction among clients is high. 94.0% are either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the amount of the food they receive at the programs. Client satisfaction with specific aspects of the programs follows:

- 89.7% of the clients are either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the variety of the food.
- 95.2% of the clients are either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with overall quality of the food.
- 76.7% of the clients say that they are treated with respect by the staff all the time.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

9.3 WHAT CLIENTS WOULD DO WITHOUT FOOD ASSISTANCE FROM THE AGENCY

Clients were asked what they would do without the agency helping them. Results are shown in Table 9.3.1.

TABLE 9.3.1

WHAT CLIENTS WOULD DO WITHOUT FOOD ASSISTANCE FROM THE AGENCY

<i>If this agency weren't here to help you or your household with food, what would you do?^a</i>	Pantry Client Households	Kitchen Client Households	Shelter Client Households	All Client Households
Go to another agency	74.4%	n.p.	N.A.	70.4%
Get help from relatives, friends	35.3%	n.p.	N.A.	31.5%
Get help from the government	9.3%	n.p.	N.A.	8.3%
Get a job, more hours, an additional job	18.3%	n.p.	N.A.	16.4%
Sell some personal property	21.3%	n.p.	N.A.	20.1%
Lower expenses	21.1%	n.p.	N.A.	19.0%
Eat less, skip meals, reduce size of meals	40.3%	n.p.	N.A.	36.3%
Would get by somehow	54.0%	n.p.	N.A.	51.5%
I have no other place to get help	5.9%	n.p.	N.A.	6.2%
Do something illegal	4.8%	n.p.	N.A.	4.3%
Do not know	3.0%	n.p.	N.A.	5.7%
Other ^b	1.0%	n.p.	N.A.	0.9%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	101	24	N.A.	125

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 55 of the client survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include cases with missing data.

Missing and refusal responses combined are 3.7% for pantry clients, 2.6% for kitchen clients, N.A. for shelter clients, and 3.6% for all clients.


^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bThis includes eating at home and begging.

In the absence of the agency helping the clients, 70.4% of them said that they would go to another agency. Other responses include:

- 51.5% of the clients said that they would get by somehow.
- 31.5% of the clients said that they would get help from relatives or friends.

- 36.3% of the clients said that they would eat less, skip meals, or reduce the size of meals.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

10. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: PROFILES

Until now, the discussion has focused on information from the *client* survey. This chapter begins the presentation of the results from the survey of *agencies* affiliated with Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The first section below details the numbers of responses received from various types of agencies. Next we present information on what combinations of programs are operated by the responding agencies. Subsequent sections examine characteristics of emergency food programs operated by these agencies, such as years of program operation, services provided other than food distribution, and types of organizations. Agency estimates of the changes in their numbers of clients between 2005 and 2009 are also presented.

10.1 PARTICIPATING AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS REPRESENTED

The agency survey questionnaire was sent to 25 agencies affiliated with Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. Each agency was asked to provide detailed information about one of each type of emergency food programs it operates (such as one pantry, one kitchen, and one shelter). Agencies operating nonemergency food programs only (referred to as “other programs”) were asked to answer several general questions only.

Of the agencies that received the questionnaire, 22 agencies completed the survey. Among those that completed the survey, 18 operate one or more emergency programs, and the remaining agencies operate other nonemergency food programs. Those 22 responding agencies

reported on 43 programs,²⁵ of which 62.8% are emergency food programs. Table 10.1.1 shows the breakdown of the participating agencies by the type of program they operate.

TABLE 10.1.1

PROGRAMS REPORTED ON BY PARTICIPATING AGENCIES, BY PROGRAM TYPE

Program Type	Number	Unweighted Percentage	Unweighted Percentage Excluding "Other" Type
Pantry	16	37.2%	59.3%
Kitchen	6	14.0%	22.2%
Shelter	5	11.6%	18.5%
Other ^a	16	37.2%	n.a.
TOTAL ^b	43	100.0%	100.0%

^aOther programs refer to nonemergency food programs. They are programs that have a primary purpose other than emergency food distribution but also distribute food. Examples include day care programs, senior congregate-feeding programs, and summer camps.


^bThis is the number of programs about which agencies provide detailed or some information. The total number of programs operated by these agencies is larger.

Among the total of 43 programs reported on by the agencies, 37.2% are pantries, 14.0% are kitchens, and 11.6% are shelters. The remaining 37.2% are other nonemergency food programs, such as child day care, senior-congregate feeding programs, and summer camps.

Excluding other nonemergency food programs makes the percentage breakdown 59.3% pantries, 22.2% kitchens, and 18.5% shelters.

²⁵ There are more programs than agencies, because agencies often run two or more programs of different types.

**CHART 10.1.1 PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATING PROGRAMS
By Program Type**



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p" or "N.A". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

10.2 NUMBER OF PROGRAMS OPERATED BY AGENCIES

Percentages of the agencies operating various types of programs, as well as the total number of programs operated of each program type, are shown in Table 10.2.1.

TABLE 10.2.1

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS OPERATED BY AGENCIES

Number of Programs of Each Type Operated by Agencies	Percentage of All Agencies That Operate the Specified Number of Each Program Type			
	Agencies with Pantries	Agencies with Kitchens	Agencies with Shelters	Agencies with Others
1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	93.8%
2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3 or more	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Agencies with at least one program for each program type	16	6	5	16
Total number of participating agencies		22		
Total number of programs reported on by participating agencies		43		

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 1 of the agency survey.

Among the participating agencies, 16 operate at least one pantry program, 6 at least one kitchen program, and 5 at least one shelter program. A total of 22 agencies provided information about 43 programs.

10.3 AGENCIES OPERATING VARIOUS TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Table 10.3.1 shows the distribution of agencies by types of programs they operate.

TABLE 10.3.1

AGENCIES OPERATING VARIOUS TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Combinations of Programs the Agency Operates	Agencies
Pantry only	4.5%
Kitchen only	0.0%
Shelter only	9.1%
Other program only	18.2%
Pantry and Kitchen	4.5%
Kitchen and Shelter	0.0%
Shelter and Pantry	0.0%
Pantry and Other	40.9%
Kitchen and Other	0.0%
Shelter and Other	0.0%
Pantry, Kitchen, and Shelter	9.1%
Pantry, Kitchen, and Other	9.1%
Kitchen, Shelter, and Other	0.0%
Shelter, Pantry, and Other	0.0%
Pantry, Kitchen, Shelter, and Other	4.5%
Unknown	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Total number of participating agencies	22

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on responses to Question 1 of the agency survey.

As Table 10.3.1 shows, 4.5% of the participating agencies exclusively operate one or more pantries, while 0.0% and 9.1% operate exclusively kitchen or shelter programs, respectively.

10.4 LENGTH OF PROGRAM OPERATION

Responding agencies identified the year their emergency food programs opened. Table 10.4.1 shows the distribution of the length of program operation.

TABLE 10.4.1

LENGTH OF PROGRAM OPERATION

How Long the Program Has Been Operating ^a	Percentage of Programs That Have Operated for a Specified Period			Agencies with Pantry, Kitchen, or Shelter
	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs	
2 years or less	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3-4 years	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5-6 years	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7-10 years	16.7%	25.0%	0.0%	14.3%
11-20 years	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	28.6%
21-30 years	16.7%	25.0%	0.0%	21.4%
More than 30 years	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	35.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5	18
Average length of operation among valid responses (in years)	25	12	16	25
Median length of operation among valid responses (in years)	26	7	15	26
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	12	4	3	14

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 3b of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 25.0% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, 40.0% for shelter programs, and 22.2% for all agencies.

^aFor all programs, responses greater than 70 years of operation were recoded as 70 years. Responses less than 1 year were recoded as 1 year.

The average length of operation among the pantry programs is 25 years. It is 12 years for the kitchens and 16 years for the shelter programs. Details follow:

- 0.0% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters have been operating for two years or less.

- 25.0% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 100.0% of the shelters have been operating for 11 to 20 years.
- 16.7% of the pantries, 25.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters have been operating for 21 to 30 years.
- 41.7% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters have been operating for more than 30 years.

10.5 OTHER SERVICES OR FACILITIES PROVIDED IN ADDITION TO FOOD DISTRIBUTION

Agencies were provided with a list of additional possible services and asked which services their programs provide to their clients. Table 10.5.1 shows what percentage of food programs supply the services listed.

TABLE 10.5.1

OTHER SERVICES OR FACILITIES AGENCIES OR PROGRAMS PROVIDE IN ADDITION TO FOOD DISTRIBUTION, BY PROGRAM TYPE

	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Food-related support			
Nutrition counseling	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Eligibility counseling for WIC	20.0%	0.0%	60.0%
Eligibility counseling for SNAP benefits	26.7%	0.0%	60.0%
Soup kitchen meals	20.0%	n.a.	0.0%
Food pantry bags	n.a.	50.0%	20.0%
Client training			
Employment training	13.3%	25.0%	20.0%
Supported employment (Welfare to Work or job training)	6.7%	25.0%	20.0%
Retraining physically disabled	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Retraining mentally ill/challenged	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Other assistance			
Eligibility counseling for other government programs	20.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Legal services	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
Tax preparation help (Earned Income Tax Credit)	6.7%	25.0%	40.0%
Utility bill assistance (Low-Income Heating and Energy Assistance Programs)	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Short-term financial assistance	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Budget and credit counseling	6.7%	0.0%	40.0%
Consumer protection	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Information and referral	66.7%	75.0%	60.0%
Language translation	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%

	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Housing services			
Short-term shelter	13.3%	25.0%	60.0%
Subsidized housing assistance	13.3%	25.0%	40.0%
Housing rehabilitation or repair	6.7%	0.0%	20.0%
Health and other services			
Health services or health clinics	6.7%	25.0%	0.0%
Transportation	6.7%	0.0%	20.0%
Clothing	80.0%	25.0%	60.0%
Furniture	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%
Senior programs	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%
No additional services	6.7%	25.0%	20.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 4 of the agency survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.3% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, and 0.0% for shelter programs.

20.0% of pantries and 60.0% of shelters provide eligibility counseling for WIC. Other services provided by the programs or the agencies include:

- 26.7% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters provide eligibility counseling for SNAP benefits.
- 0.0% of the shelters provide counseling for other government programs.
- 33.3% of the pantries provide utility bill assistance.
- 66.7% of the pantries, 75.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters provide information and referral services.
- 20.0% of the shelters provide employment training.
- 6.7% of the pantries, 25.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters provide health services or health clinics.
- 20.0% of the shelters provide transportation.
- 80.0% of the pantries, 25.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters provide clothing.

Table 10.5.2 shows the distribution of the number of additional services that emergency food programs offer to their clients.

TABLE 10.5.2
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL SERVICES, BY PROGRAM TYPE

Number of Additional Services or Facilities Provided by Programs	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
None	6.7%	25.0%	20.0%
1	13.3%	25.0%	0.0%
2-5	46.7%	25.0%	20.0%
6-10	26.7%	25.0%	60.0%
More than 10	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5
Average number of additional services among those that provide at least one such service	5	3	6
Median number of additional services among those that provide at least one such service	4	2	6
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	15	4	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 4 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.3% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, and 0.0% for shelter programs.

On average, pantries provide 5 additional services or facilities. Kitchens and shelters provide, on average, 3 and 6 additional services, respectively.

- 6.7% of pantry programs, 25.0% of kitchen programs, and 20.0% of shelter programs do not offer any other services or facilities.
- 13.3% of pantry programs, 25.0% of kitchen programs, and 0.0% of the shelter programs offer one additional service or facility.

- 46.7% of pantry programs, 25.0% of kitchen programs, and 20.0% of shelter programs offer two to five additional services or facilities.
- 26.7% of pantry programs, 25.0% of kitchen programs, and 60.0% of shelter programs offer as many as 6 to 10 additional services or facilities.
- 6.7% of pantry programs, 0.0% of kitchen programs, and 0.0% of shelter programs offer more than 10 additional services or facilities.

In addition to other services provided by their programs, agencies were asked whether they provide other facilities at the agency level for their clients. Table 10.5.3 summarizes the results.

TABLE 10.5.3
OTHER FACILITIES AGENCIES PROVIDE IN ADDITION TO
FOOD DISTRIBUTION, BY PROGRAM TYPE

	Agencies with Pantry, Kitchen, or Shelter
Health clinic	0.0%
Group home for physically/mentally disadvantaged	0.0%
Other residential facility	10.0%
Child day care program	0.0%
Youth after school program	0.0%
Summer camp serving low-income clients	10.0%
Senior congregate feeding program	0.0%
Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) ^a	0.0%
Other ^b	8.3%
No other facilities/programs	90.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	18

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 26 of the agency survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 16.7%.

^aFor states in which the CSFP was not offered, agencies most likely confused food received from TEFAP with food received from CSFP.

^bThis includes learning centers, food delivery services, and day programs for mentally disabled adults.

As many as 0.0% of agencies also operate health clinics. Other facilities run by agencies include:

- 0.0% of agencies run group homes for physically/mentally disadvantaged.
- 10.0% of agencies run other types of residential facilities.
- 0.0% of agencies run child day care programs.
- 0.0% of agencies run youth after-school programs.
- 10.0% of agencies run summer camps serving low-income clients.
- 0.0% of agencies run senior congregate-feeding programs.
- 0.0% of agencies run a Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP).
- 8.3% of agencies run some other type of facility not mentioned above.

10.6 TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM

Table 10.6.1 shows types of agencies operating each type of program.

TABLE 10.6.1

TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM

Type of Agency That Operates the Program	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs	Agencies with Pantry, Kitchen, or Shelter	All Agencies
Faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	38.9%	33.3%
Other private nonprofit	43.8%	66.7%	80.0%	50.0%	57.1%
Governmental	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Community Action Program (CAP)	6.3%	16.7%	0.0%	5.6%	4.8%
Other ^a	6.3%	16.7%	20.0%	5.6%	4.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5	18	22

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 27 of the agency survey.


NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, 0.0% for kitchen programs, 0.0% for shelter programs, 0.0% for agencies with pantry, kitchen, or shelter programs, and 4.5% for all agencies.

^aThis includes various community-based organizations.

Table 10.6.1 shows that 43.8% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters are run by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies. In addition:

- 0.0% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters are run by government-affiliated agencies.
- The remaining agencies are operated by other kinds of private nonprofit organizations, such as community-based charities or philanthropic organizations.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

10.7 PROGRAMS SERVING SELECTED TYPES OF CLIENTS

Agencies were asked whether their programs serve migrant workers, legal immigrants, or undocumented immigrants.²⁶

TABLE 10.7.1
PROGRAMS SERVING SELECTED TYPES OF CLIENTS

	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Migrant Workers			
Yes	70.0%	33.3%	33.3%
No	30.0%	66.7%	66.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Legal Immigrants			
Yes	81.8%	50.0%	50.0%
No	18.2%	50.0%	50.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Undocumented Immigrants			
Yes	70.0%	33.3%	33.3%
No	30.0%	66.7%	66.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 18 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For migrant workers, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 37.5% for pantry programs, 50.0% for kitchen programs, and 40.0% for shelter programs.

For legal immigrants, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 31.3% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

For undocumented immigrants, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 37.5% for pantry programs, 50.0% for kitchen programs, and 40.0% for shelter programs.

²⁶ The question asked "do the selected programs currently serve any of the following groups?" Agencies had to select "yes", "no", or "don't know" for each of the three types of clients. At the national level, a large number of the responding agencies left these three questions unanswered.

Findings in Table 10.7.1 include:

- 70.0% of the pantries, 33.3% of the kitchens, and 33.3% of the shelters serve migrant workers.
- 81.8% of the pantries, 50.0% of the kitchens, and 50.0% of the shelters serve legal immigrants.
- 70.0% of the pantries, 33.3% of the kitchens, and 33.3% of the shelters serve undocumented immigrants.

10.8 AGENCY ESTIMATES OF CHANGE IN NUMBER OF CLIENTS FROM 2006 TO 2009

Agencies were asked whether they serve more or fewer clients than they did in 2006.

Table 10.8.1 shows the findings.

TABLE 10.8.1

AGENCY ESTIMATES OF CHANGE IN NUMBER OF CLIENTS FROM 2006 TO 2009

Agency Estimate of Change in the Number of Clients Compared with Year 2006	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
More clients	93.8%	80.0%	25.0%
Fewer clients	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
About the same number of clients	0.0%	20.0%	75.0%
Program did not exist in 2006	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 7 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

Regarding the volume of the clients, 93.8% of the pantries, 80.0% of the kitchens, and 25.0% of the shelters indicate that they serve more clients now than they did in 2006.

- 0.0% of the pantries, 20.0% of the kitchens, and 75.0% of the shelters indicated that they serve about the same number of clients in 2009 as in 2006.
- 0.0% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters indicated that they serve fewer clients in 2009 than they did in 2006.
- 6.3% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters did not exist in 2006.

10.9 SEASONALITY OF CLIENT MIX

Agencies were asked whether their programs experience significant change in client mix by season and, if so, what kinds of change. Results are shown in Table 10.9.1.

TABLE 10.9.1
SEASONALITY OF CLIENT MIX

Nature of Changes in Client Mix During the Year ^a	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Ratio of men to women changes	25.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Mix of ethnic groups changes	18.8%	20.0%	40.0%
Many more children in summer	18.8%	40.0%	60.0%
Many more migrant workers in summer	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Many more migrant workers in winter	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Different group of people at the holidays	43.8%	80.0%	60.0%
Other ^b	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Do not experience change in client mix	50.0%	20.0%	0.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	5	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 19 of the agency survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, and 0.0% for shelter programs.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bThis includes fewer elderly people in winter and more families in winter.

We find that 50.0% of the pantries, 20.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters indicated that they do not experience seasonal changes in the mix of clients during the year. As to the nature of seasonal changes:

- 25.0% of the pantries, 20.0% of the kitchens, and 20.0% of the shelters said they experience changes in the ratio of men to women.

- 18.8% of the pantries, 40.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters said they serve more children in summer.
- 43.8% of the pantries, 80.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters said they serve a different group of people during the holidays.

11. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: FOOD SERVICES

In understanding the workings of the FA network, it is important to understand the broad differences between providers in their scales of operations. The chapter discusses a number of indicators of the size of provider food service operations. As will be seen, providers vary dramatically in size, from pantries that serve just a few clients a day to pantries and kitchens that provide food to hundreds of clients on a given day of operation.

There is great variation among providers in the detail with which they keep long-term records such as service and client counts. Therefore, the analysis below focuses on measures of size based on either a “typical week” or on the “most recent day the provider was open,” since these are the size concepts to which respondents were in general best able to relate.

11.1 NUMBER OF BOXES OR BAGS DISTRIBUTED IN A TYPICAL WEEK

Agencies were asked how much food their pantries distribute during a typical week. Table 11.1.1 shows the results.

TABLE 11.1.1
NUMBER OF BOXES OR BAGS DISTRIBUTED IN A TYPICAL WEEK

Pantry Programs	
Programs distributing the following number of boxes or bags of food in a typical week ^a :	
1-9	0.0%
10-29	6.7%
30-49	0.0%
50-99	13.3%
100-299	53.3%
300-499	26.7%
500 or more	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16

	Pantry Programs
Average number of boxes or bags of food distributed in a typical week among valid responses ^b	197
Median number of boxes or bags of food distributed in a typical week among valid responses ^b	140
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	15

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to question 6 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all pantries (as noted earlier in this footnote only) of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.3% for pantry programs.

^aFor pantries, responses greater than 5,000 bags or boxes distributed were recoded as 5,000 bags or boxes.

^bIn 2005 and 2009, zeros as responses were included as valid responses for calculating the average and the median.

On average, the participating pantries distributed 197 boxes or bags (median: 140) of food during a typical week. More details on the amount of food distributed during a typical week follow:

- 6.7% of the pantries distributed 10 to 29 boxes or bags of food.
- 0.0% of the pantries distributed 30 to 49 boxes or bags of food.
- 13.3% of the pantries distributed 50 to 99 boxes or bags of food.
- 53.3% of the pantries distributed 100 to 299 boxes or bags of food.
- 26.7% of the pantries distributed 300 to 499 boxes or bags of food.
- 0.0% of the pantries distributed 500 or more boxes or bags.

11.2 AMOUNT OF FOOD SERVED ON THE DAY THE PROGRAM WAS LAST OPEN

Agencies were asked how much food their programs distributed when they were last open. Results are presented in Table 11.2.1.

TABLE 11.2.1

AMOUNT OF FOOD SERVED ON THE DAY THE PROGRAM WAS LAST OPEN

	Pantry Programs (in Bags or Boxes)	Kitchen Programs (in Meals)	Shelter Programs (in Meals)
Programs that distributed the following number of boxes/bags or meals of food ^{a,b}			
1-9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10-29	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
30-49	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%
50-99	28.6%	40.0%	33.3%
100-149	7.1%	0.0%	66.7%
150-199	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
200-249	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
250 or more	7.1%	60.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5
Average number of bags or boxes of food distributed, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	117	n.a.	n.a.
Median number of bags or boxes of food distributed, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	65	n.a.	n.a.
Average number of meals served, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	n.a.	218	101
Median number of meals served, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	n.a.	250	113
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	15	5	3

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 6b of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 12.5% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, and 40.0% for shelter programs.

^aFor pantries and kitchens, responses greater than 1,000 bags or boxes distributed or meals served were recoded as 1,000 bags or boxes distributed or meals served. For shelters, responses greater than 300 meals served were recoded as 300 meals served.

^bThe amounts distributed per day can vary substantially over the month, particularly for pantries, so responses may depend on when the survey was filled out.

^cZeros as responses were not included as valid responses for calculating the average and the median.

Emergency food programs vary greatly in size. On average, the pantry programs distributed 117 boxes/bags (median: 65) of food when they were last open. The kitchen programs distributed 218 meals (median: 250) and the shelter programs distributed 101 meals (median: 113). Details follow:

- 0.0% of the pantries and 0.0% of the shelters distributed 1 to 9 boxes or bags or meals of food on the day they were last open.
- 64.3% of the pantries and 33.3% of the shelters distributed 10 to 99 boxes or bags or meals of food on the day they were last open.
- 14.3% of the pantries and 0.0% of the shelters distributed 200 or more boxes or bags or meals of food on the day they were last open.
- 60.0% of the kitchens served more than 200 meals on the day they were last open.

Table 11.2.2 describes how much food programs distributed when they were last open according to the type of agency that operates the program.

TABLE 11.2.2
AMOUNT OF FOOD SERVED ON THE DAY THE PROGRAM WAS LAST OPEN,
BY TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM

	Agency Type			
	Faith-Based or Religion- Affiliated Nonprofit	Other Private Nonprofit	Governmental	Community Action Program (CAP)
Pantry Programs				
Average number of bags or boxes of food distributed, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	145	77	N.A.	N.A.
Median number of bags or boxes of food distributed, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	49	65	N.A.	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	7	7	N.A.	0
Kitchen Programs				
Average number of meals served, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	N.A.	210	N.A.	N.A.
Median number of meals served, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	N.A.	193	N.A.	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	4	N.A.	0
Shelter Programs				
Average number of meals served, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	N.A.	101	N.A.	N.A.
Median number of meals served, among valid responses ^{a,b,c}	N.A.	113	N.A.	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	3	N.A.	0

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Questions 6b and 27 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For pantry programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for programs in faith-based agencies, 14.3% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and 100.0% for community action programs.

For kitchen programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are N.A. for programs in faith-based agencies, 0.0% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and 100.0% for community action programs.

For shelter programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are N.A. for programs in faith-based agencies, 25.0% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and N.A. for community action programs.

^aFor pantries and kitchens, responses greater than 1,000 bags or boxes distributed or meals served were recoded as 1,000 bags or boxes distributed or meals served. For shelters, responses greater than 300 meals served were recoded as 300 meals served.

^bIt should be noted that, particularly for pantries, amounts distributed per day can vary substantially over the month, so responses may depend on when the survey was filled out.

^cZeros as responses were not included as valid responses for calculating the average and the median.

Key findings include:

- For pantry programs, the average number of boxes/bags distributed on the day they were last open is 77 for programs operated by non-faith-based or religion-affiliated private nonprofit agencies, compared to N.A. for programs operated by governmental agencies.
- For kitchen programs, the average number of meals served on the day they were last open is N.A. for programs operated by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies, compared to N.A. for programs operated by governmental agencies.
- For shelter programs, the average number of meals served on the day they were last open is N.A. for programs operated by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies, compared to N.A. for programs operated by community action programs.

12. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: ABILITY TO MEET CLIENT NEEDS

The study has also examined the capacity of the agencies and food programs to meet client needs. Below, we consider the stability of the programs, the main problems they face, and the degree to which they have had to stretch resources or turn away clients. Reasons why some agencies have had to turn away clients are also discussed.

12.1 STABILITY OF EXISTING FOOD PROGRAMS

Agencies were asked whether their food programs are stable or facing problems that threaten their food programs' continued operation and, if so, which of several listed factors were the causes of the threat. Agencies were asked to check more than one reason, if more than one was appropriate. Table 12.1.1 shows the percentage of food programs affected by each of the factors cited.

TABLE 12.1.1
STABILITY OF EXISTING FOOD PROGRAMS

	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Nature of the problem ^a			
Problems related to funding	53.3%	75.0%	50.0%
Problems related to food supplies	40.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Problems related to paid staff or personnel	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Problems related to volunteers	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Community resistance	6.7%	25.0%	0.0%
Other problems	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Programs not facing problems that threaten their continued operation	26.7%	0.0%	25.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 17 of the agency survey.


NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.


Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.3% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

As Table 12.1.1 shows, 73.3% of the pantries, 100.0% of the kitchens, and 75.0% of the shelters believe they are facing one or more problems that threaten their continued operation:

- 53.3% of pantries, 75.0% of kitchens, and 50.0% of shelters referred to funding issues as a threat; 40.0% of the pantries, 25.0% of kitchens, and 25.0% of shelters indicated food supplies as a threat to their continued operation.
- 0.0% of kitchens and 0.0% of shelters identified issues related to paid staff or personnel as a threat; 13.3% of pantries and 0.0% of kitchens stated that volunteer-related problems posed a threat.





Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

Table 12.1.2 shows the percentage of food programs affected by each of the factors cited according to the type of agency that operates the program.

TABLE 12.1.2

STABILITY OF EXISTING FOOD PROGRAMS, BY TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM

	Agency Type			
	Faith-Based or Religion- Affiliated Nonprofit	Other Private Nonprofit	Governmental	Community Action Program (CAP)
Pantry Programs^a				
Problems related to funding	28.6%	66.7%	N.A.	100.0%
Problems related to food supplies	28.6%	50.0%	N.A.	100.0%
Problems related to paid staff or personnel	0.0%	16.7%	N.A.	100.0%
Problems related to volunteers	28.6%	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	7	7	N.A.	1
Kitchen Programs^a				
Problems related to funding	N.A.	66.7%	N.A.	N.A.
Problems related to food supplies	N.A.	33.3%	N.A.	N.A.
Problems related to paid staff or personnel	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Problems related to volunteers	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	4	N.A.	1
Shelter Programs^a				
Problems related to funding	N.A.	50.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Problems related to food supplies	N.A.	25.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Problems related to paid staff or personnel	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Problems related to volunteers	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	4	N.A.	0

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Questions 17 and 27 of the agency survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For pantry programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for programs in a faith-based agency, 14.3% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and 0.0% for community action programs.

For kitchen programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are N.A. for programs in a faith-based agency, 25.0% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and 100.0% for community action programs.

For shelter programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are N.A. for programs in a faith-based agency, 0.0% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and N.A. for community action programs.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

Key findings include:

- For pantry programs, N.A. of programs operated by governmental agencies believe they are facing problems related to funding, compared to 66.7% of programs operated by non-faith-based or religion-affiliated private nonprofit agencies.
- For kitchen programs, N.A. of programs operated by governmental agencies believe they are facing problems related to volunteers, compared to N.A. of programs operated by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies.
- For shelter programs, N.A. of programs operated by community action program agencies indicated food supplies as a threat to their continued operation. This compares to N.A. of programs operated by governmental agencies and N.A. operated by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies.

12.2 FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES

Agencies were asked whether their programs ever had to ration or limit food in order to provide some food to all clients and, if so, how often. Table 12.2.1 shows the varying degrees of frequency with which the food programs stretched food resources.

TABLE 12.2.1
FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES

During 2008, How Often Did the Program Have to Reduce Meal Portions or Reduce the Quantity of Food in Food Packages Because of a Lack of Food	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Never	43.8%	60.0%	50.0%
Rarely	31.3%	40.0%	50.0%
SUBTOTAL	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sometimes	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Always	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5


SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 13 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

During the year 2008, 43.8% of pantries, 60.0% of kitchens, and 50.0% of shelters never experienced the need to stretch food resources (reduce meal portions or reduce the quantity of food in food packages).

- Nevertheless, 25.0% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters indicated that they sometimes or always had to stretch food resources.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

Table 12.2.2 shows the varying degrees of frequency with which the food programs stretched food resources, according to the type of agency that operates the program.

TABLE 12.2.2

FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES, BY TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM

During 2008, How Often Did the Program Have to Reduce Meal Portions or Reduce the Quantity of Food in Food Packages Because of a Lack of Food	Agency Type			
	Faith-Based or Religion-Affiliated Nonprofit	Other Private Nonprofit	Governmental	Community Action Program (CAP)
Pantry Programs				
Never	42.9%	57.1%	N.A.	0.0%
Rarely	42.9%	14.3%	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	85.7%	71.4%	N.A.	0.0%
Sometimes	14.3%	28.6%	N.A.	100.0%
Always	0.0%	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
SUBTOTAL	14.3%	28.6%	N.A.	100.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	7	7	N.A.	1
Kitchen Programs				
Never	N.A.	75.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Rarely	N.A.	25.0%	N.A.	N.A.
SUBTOTAL	N.A.	100.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Sometimes	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Always	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
SUBTOTAL	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	4	N.A.	1
Shelter Programs				
Never	N.A.	50.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Rarely	N.A.	50.0%	N.A.	N.A.
SUBTOTAL	N.A.	100.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Sometimes	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
Always	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.
SUBTOTAL	N.A.	0.0%	N.A.	N.A.

During 2008, How Often Did the Program Have to Reduce Meal Portions or Reduce the Quantity of Food in Food Packages Because of a Lack of Food	Agency Type			
	Faith-Based or Religion-Affiliated Nonprofit	Other Private Nonprofit	Governmental	Community Action Program (CAP)
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	4	N.A.	0

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 13 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For pantry programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for programs operated by faith-based agencies, 0.0% for programs operated by nonprofit agencies, N.A. for programs operated by governmental agencies, and 0.0% for programs operated by community action programs.

For kitchen programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are N.A. for programs operated by faith-based agencies, 0.0% for programs operated by nonprofit agencies, N.A. for programs operated by governmental agencies, and 100.0% for programs operated by community action programs.

For shelter programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are N.A. for programs operated by faith-based agencies, 0.0% for programs operated by nonprofit agencies, N.A. for programs operated by governmental agencies, and N.A. for programs operated by community action programs.

We find that for pantry programs, N.A. of programs operated by governmental agencies never experienced the need to stretch food resources (reduce meal portions or reduce the quantity of food in food packages). This percentage is 0.0% for programs operated by community action program agencies and 42.9% for programs operated by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies. In addition, we find:

- For kitchen programs, N.A. of programs operated by governmental agencies never experienced the need to stretch food resources (reduce meal portions or reduce the quantity of food in food packages). This percentage is N.A. for programs operated by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies.
- For shelter programs, 50.0% of programs operated by non-faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies never experienced the need to stretch food resources (reduce meal portions or reduce the quantity of food in food packages). This

percentage is N.A. for programs operated by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies.

12.3 PROGRAMS THAT TURNED AWAY CLIENTS

Agencies were asked whether clients had been turned away within the past year and, if so, how many and for what reasons. Agencies were asked to use either their records or their best estimates to supply this information. Table 12.3.1 and Table 12.3.2 show the results.

TABLE 12.3.1

PROGRAMS THAT TURNED AWAY CLIENTS

	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Did the program turn away clients during the past year? ^a			
Yes	6.7%	0.0%	33.3%
No	93.3%	100.0%	66.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5
Average number of clients turned away in the past year among those that turned away at least one client	N.A.	N.A.	2,500
Median number of clients turned away in the past year among those that turned away at least one client	N.A.	N.A.	2,500
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Programs providing a valid number of clients who were turned away	0	0	1
Reasons for turning away clients ^b			
Lack of food resources	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Services needed not provided by the program	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients were ineligible or could not prove eligibility	0.0%	N.A.	100.0%
Clients abused program/came too often	100.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients exhibited drug, alcohol, or behavior problem	0.0%	N.A.	100.0%
Clients lived outside service area	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients had no proper identification	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Client's income exceeded the guidelines	100.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Other	0.0%	N.A.	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Programs that turned away clients	1	0	1

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 9, 10, and 12 of the agency survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For programs that turned away clients, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.3% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, and 40.0% for shelter programs.

For reasons for turning away clients, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, N.A. for kitchen programs, and 0.0% for shelter programs.

^aFor pantries, responses greater than 3,000 clients turned away were recoded as 3,000 clients. For kitchens and shelters, responses greater than 2,500 clients turned away were recoded as 2,500 clients.

^bMultiple responses were accepted.

As Table 12.3.1 shows, 6.7% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 33.3% of the shelters responded that they turned away clients during the past year. Reasons for turning away clients follow:

- Among programs turning away clients, 0.0% of the pantries, N.A. of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters turned away clients at least once due to lack of food resources.
- Among programs turning away clients, 0.0% of the pantries, N.A. of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters turned away clients at least once because the services needed were not provided by the program.
- Among programs turning away clients, 0.0% of the pantries, N.A. of the kitchens, and 100.0% of the shelters turned away clients at least once because the clients were ineligible or could not prove eligibility.
- Among programs turning away clients, 100.0% of the pantries, N.A. of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters turned away clients at least once because the clients abused the program or because they came too often.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

TABLE 12.3.2

MOST FREQUENT REASONS THE PROGRAM TURNED AWAY CLIENTS

	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Most frequent reason			
Lack of food or resources	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Services needed not provided by the program	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients were ineligible or could not prove eligibility	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients abused program/came too often	100.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients exhibited drug, alcohol, or behavior problem	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients lived outside service area	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients had no proper identification	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Client's income exceeded the guidelines	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Other	0.0%	N.A.	100.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Second most frequent reason			
Lack of food or resources	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Services needed not provided by the program	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients were ineligible or could not prove eligibility	0.0%	N.A.	100.0%
Clients abused program/came too often	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients exhibited drug, alcohol, or behavior problem	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients lived outside service area	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Clients had no proper identification	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Client's income exceeded the guidelines	100.0%	N.A.	0.0%
Other	0.0%	N.A.	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Programs that turned away clients	1	0	1

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 11 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the most frequent reason, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, N.A. for kitchen programs, and 0.0% for shelter programs.

For the second most frequent reason, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, N.A. for kitchen programs, and 0.0% for shelter programs.

12.4 ADDITIONAL FOOD RESOURCES NEEDED PER WEEK

Agencies were asked how much additional food is needed during a typical week to adequately meet the demand for food at kitchen and shelter programs. Results are summarized in Table 12.4.1.

TABLE 12.4.1
ADDITIONAL FOOD RESOURCES NEEDED PER WEEK

	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
No additional meals or meal equivalents needed	n.a.	60.0%	75.0%
1 to 10 additional meals or meal equivalents needed	n.a.	0.0%	0.0%
11 to 49 additional meals or meal equivalents needed	n.a.	20.0%	0.0%
50 to 149 additional meals or meal equivalents needed	n.a.	0.0%	25.0%
150 or more additional meals or meal equivalents needed	n.a.	20.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	n.a.	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	n.a.	6	5
Average number of additional meal equivalents needed among valid answers ^b	n.a.	117	100
Median number of additional meal equivalents needed among valid answers ^b	n.a.	117	100
SAMPLE SIZE (N) – Programs that need more food resources	n.a.	2	1

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 14 of the agency survey.


NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 16.7% for kitchen programs and 20.0% for shelter programs.

^aZeros as responses were not included as valid responses for calculating the average and the median. For kitchens, responses greater than 1,300 meals were recoded as 1,300 meals. For shelters, responses greater than 1,600 meals were recoded as 1,600 meals.

The percentage of programs that answered that they did not need additional food for distribution is 60.0% for kitchens and 75.0% for shelters. Results among the programs in need of additional food follow:

- The median kitchen needed more than 117 additional meal equivalents per week.
- The median shelters needed more than 100 additional meal equivalents per week.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

13. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: RESOURCES

Substantial resources are required to operate emergency food programs effectively, including food, staffing, and physical space. This chapter reports the types and sources of the resources used by providers of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. We begin by examining the sources of food reported by the providers. The use of paid and unpaid staff is then examined, with a focus on the great importance of volunteers to the system.

13.1 SOURCES OF FOOD DISTRIBUTED BY PROGRAMS

The survey asked how much of the food distributed through the emergency food programs comes from food banks, versus other sources. In particular, agencies were asked to state the percentage of food received from each of the sources shown in Table 13.1.1.

TABLE 13.1.1

SOURCES OF FOOD DISTRIBUTED BY PROGRAMS

Sources of Food	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Average percentage of food received from food bank(s)	81.0%	70.0%	36.3%
Median percentage of food received from food bank(s)	90.0%	85.0%	35.0%
Percentage of programs receiving food from ^a :			
Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) ^b	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP/EFAP)	87.5%	50.0%	25.0%
Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Church or religious congregations	86.7%	50.0%	100.0%
Local merchant or farmer donations	66.7%	75.0%	100.0%
Local food drives (e.g., Boy Scouts)	86.7%	50.0%	100.0%
Food purchased by agency	80.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Other ^c	66.7%	25.0%	25.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 8, 8a, and 8b of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For the average percentage of food received from food bank, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.7% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, and 25.0% for shelter programs.

For the percentage of programs that distribute government or USDA commodities received through CSFP, missing, don't know, and refusal responses are 12.5% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

For the percentage of programs that distribute government or USDA commodities received through TEFAP/EFAP, missing, don't know, and refusal responses are 0.0% for pantry programs, 0.0% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

For the percentage of programs that distribute government or USDA commodities received through FDPIR, missing, don't know, and refusal responses are 6.3% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

For the percentage of food from the other listed sources, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.3% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bFor states in which the CSFP was not offered, agencies most likely confused food received from TEFAP with food received from CSFP.

^cThis includes individual donations, organization gardens, and donations from other volunteer or civic groups.

According to agencies that operate the program, food banks are a major source of food. 81.0% of the food the pantries distribute, 70.0% of the food the kitchens serve, and 36.3% of the food the shelters serve are provided by their food banks. Programs also receive food from other sources:

- 87.5% of pantries, 50.0% of kitchens, and 25.0% of shelters receive food from TEFAP.
- 86.7% of pantries, 50.0% of kitchens, and 100.0% of shelters receive food from churches or religious congregations.
- 66.7% of pantries, 75.0% of kitchens, and 100.0% of shelters receive food from local merchants or farmer donations.
- 86.7% of pantries, 50.0% of kitchens, and 100.0% of shelters receive food from local food drives.

Table 13.1.2 presents the percentage of food received from a program's food bank according to the type of agency that operates the program.

TABLE 13.1.2
PERCENTAGE OF FOOD RECEIVED BY PROGRAMS FROM FOOD BANK,
BY TYPE OF AGENCY THAT OPERATES THE PROGRAM

Sources of Food	Agency Type			
	Faith-Based or Religion- Affiliated Nonprofit	Other Private Nonprofit	Governmental	Community Action Program (CAP)
Pantry Programs				
Average percentage of food received from food bank(s)	81.7%	80.0%	N.A.	80.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	7	7	N.A.	1
Kitchen Programs				
Average percentage of food received from food bank(s)	N.A.	66.3%	N.A.	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	4	N.A.	1
Shelter Programs				
Average percentage of food received from food bank(s)	N.A.	36.3%	N.A.	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	0	4	N.A.	0

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 8, 8a, 8b, and 27 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For pantry programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 14.3% for programs run by faith-based agencies, 0.0% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and 0.0% for community action programs.

For kitchen programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are N.A. for programs run by faith-based agencies, 0.0% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and 100.0% for community action programs.

For shelter programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are N.A. for programs run by faith-based agencies, 0.0% for private nonprofit programs, N.A. for governmental programs, and N.A. for community action programs.

Key findings include:

- Pantry programs operated by governmental agencies receive N.A. of their food from the program's food bank, whereas those operated by community action program agencies receive 80.0% from the program's food bank.
- Kitchen programs operated by faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies receive N.A. of their food from the program's food bank, whereas those operated by non-faith-based or non-religion-affiliated agencies receive 66.3% from the program's food bank.
- Shelter programs operated by governmental agencies receive N.A. of their food from the program's food bank. This compares to N.A. for programs operated by a faith-based or religion-affiliated agency.

Table 13.1.3 presents the percentage of food received from a program's food bank according to the frequency with which the program stretched food resources.

TABLE 13.1.3
PERCENTAGE OF FOOD RECEIVED BY PROGRAMS FROM FOOD BANK,
BY FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES

Sources of Food	Frequency of Stretching Food Resources		
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes or Always
Pantry Programs			
Average percentage of food received from food bank(s)	67.5%	87.0%	93.8%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	7	5	4
Kitchen Programs			
Average percentage of food received from food bank(s)	83.3%	50.0%	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	3	2	N.A.
Shelter Programs			
Average percentage of food received from food bank(s)	35.0%	37.5%	N.A.
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	2	2	N.A.

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 8, 8a, 8b, and 13 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The estimates presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For pantry programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 16.7% for programs which report never having to stretch food resources, 0.0% for programs which rarely have to stretch food resources, and 0.0% for programs which sometimes or always have to stretch food resources.

For kitchen programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for programs which report never having to stretch food resources, 0.0% for programs which rarely have to stretch food resources, and N.A. for programs which sometimes or always have to stretch food resources.

For shelter programs, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for programs which report never having to stretch food resources, 0.0% for programs which rarely have to stretch food resources, and N.A. for programs which sometimes or always have to stretch food resources.

We find that pantry programs who report stretching food resources either "sometimes" or "always" receive 93.8% of their food from the program's food bank. Those who

report never having to stretch food resources receive 67.5% from the program's food bank. In addition:

- Kitchen programs who report stretching food resources either "sometimes" or "always" receive N.A. of their food from the program's food bank. Those who report never having to stretch food resources receive 83.3% from the program's food bank.
- Shelter programs who report stretching food resources either "sometimes" or "always" receive N.A. of their food from the program's food bank. Those who report never having to stretch food resources receive 35.0% from the program's food bank.

13.2 STAFF AND VOLUNTEER RESOURCES DURING PREVIOUS WEEK

Agencies were asked how many paid staff and volunteers they had and how many volunteer hours they had received during the previous week. Table 13.2.1 presents the results.

TABLE 13.2.1
STAFF AND VOLUNTEER RESOURCES DURING PREVIOUS WEEK

Staff and Volunteer Resources	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs	Other Programs
Number of paid staff ^a				
None	57.1%	50.0%	20.0%	n.a.
1	7.1%	25.0%	0.0%	n.a.
2	7.1%	25.0%	0.0%	n.a.
3	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	n.a.
4	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	n.a.
5	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	n.a.
6-10	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	n.a.
More than 10	7.1%	0.0%	20.0%	n.a.
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n.a.
Average number of paid staff among valid responses	2	1	5	n.a.
Median number of paid staff among valid responses	0	1	5	n.a.
Number of volunteers ^b				
None	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
2-3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4-6	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
7-10	6.3%	20.0%	25.0%	0.0%
11-20	37.5%	20.0%	25.0%	20.0%
21-50	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
More than 50	25.0%	60.0%	25.0%	20.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average number of volunteers among valid responses	42	61	28	18
Median number of volunteers among valid responses	23	80	23	5

Staff and Volunteer Resources	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs	Other Programs
Number of volunteer hours ^c				
None	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
1-5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
6-10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11-25	6.3%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%
26-50	12.5%	20.0%	25.0%	0.0%
51-100	31.3%	40.0%	75.0%	20.0%
More than 100	43.8%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average number of volunteer hours among valid responses (hours)	148	145	70	18
Median number of volunteer hours among valid responses (hours)	78	60	75	5
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5	16

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 15, 16, and 26 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

For number of paid staff, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 12.5% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, and 0.0% for shelter programs.

For number of volunteers, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, 20.0% for shelter programs, and 68.8% for other programs.

For number of volunteer hours, missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, 20.0% for shelter programs, and 68.8% for other programs.

^aFor pantries and kitchens, responses greater than 50 paid staff members were recoded as 50 paid staff members. For shelters, responses greater than 75 paid staff members were recoded as 75 paid staff members.


^bFor pantries, kitchens, and shelters, responses greater than 200 volunteers were recoded as 200 volunteers. For other programs, responses greater than 3,500 volunteers were recoded as 3,500 volunteers.

^cFor pantries, kitchens, and shelters, responses greater than 1,000 volunteer hours were recoded as 1,000 volunteer hours. For other programs, responses greater than 7,000 volunteer hours were recoded as 7,000 volunteer hours.

As Table 13.2.1 shows, 57.1% of the pantries, 50.0% of the kitchens, and 20.0% of the shelters had no paid staff in their workforce during the week prior to this study. The median

number of paid staff was 0 for the pantries, 1 for the kitchens, and 5 for the shelters. More results include:

- The median number of volunteers in a week was 23 for the pantries, 80 for the kitchens, and 23 for the shelters, and 5 for the other programs.
- The median number of volunteer hours during the previous week was 78 for the pantries, 60 for the kitchens, and 75 for the shelters, and 5 for the other programs.
- 6.3% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters, and 20.0% of the other programs had no volunteers in their workforce during the previous week of this study.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

13.3 PRODUCTS PURCHASED FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN FOOD BANKS

Agencies were asked to indicate the categories of products that their programs purchased with cash from sources other than their food bank resources. Results based on agency responses are summarized in Table 13.3.1.

TABLE 13.3.1

PRODUCTS PURCHASED FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN FOOD BANK

Categories of Products Programs Purchased with Cash from Sources Other than the Agency's Food Bank ^a	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs	Agencies with Pantry, Kitchen, or Shelter
Bread, cereal, rice, and pasta	68.8%	60.0%	60.0%	72.2%
Fresh fruits and vegetables	25.0%	20.0%	80.0%	38.9%
Canned or frozen fruits and vegetables	50.0%	20.0%	40.0%	55.6%
Meat, poultry, fish, beans, eggs, and nuts	56.3%	40.0%	60.0%	66.7%
Milk, yogurt, and cheese	31.3%	0.0%	60.0%	44.4%
Fats, oils, condiments, and sweets	37.5%	20.0%	40.0%	44.4%
Cleaning or personal hygiene products, diapers, and toilet paper	50.0%	20.0%	60.0%	61.1%
Other ^b	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No outside purchases	12.5%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5	18

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 22 of the agency survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 0.0% for pantry programs, 16.7% for kitchen programs, 0.0% for shelter programs, and 0.0% for agencies with a pantry, kitchen, or shelter.

^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bThis includes beverages, such as coffee, tea, and juice; paper products, such as plastic utensils, paper plates, and garbage bags; and laundry products.

As Table 13.3.1 shows, 12.5% of the pantries, 20.0% of the kitchens, and 20.0% of the shelters did not purchase products from sources other than their food banks. However, most

emergency food programs purchased products they needed from sources other than their food banks. More details follow:

- 68.8% of the pantries, 60.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters purchased bread, cereal, rice, and pasta.
- 25.0% of the pantries, 20.0% of the kitchens, and 80.0% of the shelters purchased fresh fruits and vegetables.
- 50.0% of the pantries, 20.0% of the kitchens, and 40.0% of the shelters purchased canned or frozen fruits and vegetables.
- 56.3% of the pantries, 40.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters purchased meat, poultry, fish, beans, eggs, and nuts.
- 31.3% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters purchased milk, yogurt, and cheese.
- 37.5% of the pantries, 20.0% of the kitchens, and 40.0% of the shelters purchased fats, oils, condiments, and sweets.
- 50.0% of the pantries, 20.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters purchased cleaning or personal hygiene products, diapers, and toilet paper.

14. AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS: IMPORTANCE OF FOOD BANKS

At the national level, food banks are by far the single largest source of food to agencies and programs. This chapter examines the providers' relationship to the food banks in more detail. We first present tabulations of what products the providers would like to be able to obtain in greater quantity from their food banks. Subsequent sections explore the overall importance of the food banks to the operations of the providers and additional types of services the providers would like to obtain from the food banks.

14.1 PRODUCTS NEEDED FROM FOOD BANKS

Agencies were asked to identify the categories of products they need more of from their food bank. Table 14.1.1 presents the findings.

TABLE 14.1.1
PRODUCTS NEEDED FROM FOOD BANKS

Categories of Food and Nonfood Products Programs Need or Need More of from Their Food Bank ^a	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs	Agencies with Pantry, Kitchen, or Shelter
Bread, cereal, rice, and pasta	60.0%	75.0%	40.0%	55.6%
Fresh fruits and vegetables	53.3%	50.0%	80.0%	61.1%
Canned or frozen fruits and vegetables	60.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Meat, poultry, fish, beans, eggs, and nuts	73.3%	75.0%	60.0%	77.8%
Milk, yogurt, and cheese	80.0%	75.0%	60.0%	83.3%
Fats, oils, condiments, and sweets	26.7%	50.0%	20.0%	27.8%
Cleaning or personal hygiene products, diapers, and toilet paper	60.0%	50.0%	60.0%	66.7%
Other ^b	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5	18

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 23 of the agency survey.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.



Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.3% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, 0.0% for shelter programs, and 0.0% for agencies with a pantry, kitchen, or shelter.


^aMultiple responses were accepted.

^bThis includes paper products, such as plastic utensils, paper plates, and garbage bags; beverages, such as juice, coffee, and tea; and dietary supplements, such as vitamins and Ensure.

As presented in Table 14.1.1, many agencies wish to receive more of certain products from their food banks. Specifics are as follows:

- 60.0% of the pantries, 75.0% of the kitchens, and 40.0% of the shelters need more bread, cereal, rice, and pasta.
- 53.3% of the pantries, 50.0% of the kitchens, and 80.0% of the shelters need more fresh fruits and vegetables.
- 60.0% of the pantries, 50.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters need more canned or frozen fruits and vegetables.
- 73.3% of the pantries, 75.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters need more meat, poultry, fish, beans, eggs, and nuts.
- 80.0% of the pantries, 75.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters need more milk, yogurt, and cheese.
- 26.7% of the pantries, 50.0% of the kitchens, and 20.0% of the shelters need more fats, oils, condiments, and sweets.
- 60.0% of the pantries, 50.0% of the kitchens, and 60.0% of the shelters need more products in the category of cleaning or personal hygiene products, diapers, and toilet paper.





Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

14.2 IMPACT OF ELIMINATION OF FOOD BANK

Agencies were asked how much of an impact the elimination of their food bank would have on their programs. Table 14.2.1 shows the results.

TABLE 14.2.1
IMPACT OF ELIMINATION OF FOOD BANK

<i>If the Food Supply You (i.e., Agency) Receive from Your Food Bank Was Eliminated, How Much of an Impact Would This Have on Your Program?</i>	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
No impact at all	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Minimal impact	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Significant impact	13.3%	0.0%	50.0%
Devastating impact	86.7%	100.0%	50.0%
Unsure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5


SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 24 of the agency survey.

NOTES: The percentages presented in this table are based only on usable responses, excluding missing, don't know, and refusal responses. All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Missing, don't know, and refusal responses combined are 6.3% for pantry programs, 33.3% for kitchen programs, and 20.0% for shelter programs.

The results show that 100.0% of the pantries, 100.0% of the kitchens, and 100.0% of the shelters said that the elimination of support from their food banks would have a significant or devastating impact on their operation. Details include:

- 86.7% of the pantries, 100.0% of the kitchens, and 50.0% of the shelters believed that the elimination of the food bank would have a devastating impact on their programs.
- Another 13.3% of the pantries, 0.0% of the kitchens, and 50.0% of the shelters believed that the elimination of the food bank would have a significant impact on their programs.



Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

14.3 AREAS OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE DESIRED

Agencies were asked what kinds of additional assistance, in addition to food, they need to meet their clients' needs. Findings are presented in Table 14.3.1.

TABLE 14.3.1
AREAS OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE DESIRED

Programs That Need Additional Assistance in Any of the Following Areas ^a	Pantry Programs	Kitchen Programs	Shelter Programs
Nutrition education	88.9%	100.0%	0.0%
Training in food handling	75.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Accessing local resources	90.9%	75.0%	100.0%
Advocacy training	71.4%	50.0%	N.A.
SNAP benefits and outreach	83.3%	100.0%	N.A.
Summer feeding programs	71.4%	50.0%	0.0%
Other ^b	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SAMPLE SIZE (N)	16	6	5

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 25 of the agency survey.

NOTE: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of Second Harvest Inland Northwest - Clark County.


^aMultiple responses were accepted.



^bThis includes funding and addiction programs.

Some programs wished to receive further assistance from their food banks in one or more of the areas specified in Table 14.3.1. Details include:

- 88.9% of the pantries, 100.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters said that they needed additional assistance in nutrition education.
- 75.0% of the pantries, 100.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters said that they needed additional assistance in training in food handling.
- 90.9% of the pantries, 75.0% of the kitchens, and 100.0% of the shelters said that they needed additional assistance in accessing local resources.
- 71.4% of the pantries, 50.0% of the kitchens, and N.A. of the shelters said that they needed additional assistance in advocacy training.

- 83.3% of the pantries, 100.0% of the kitchens, and N.A. of the shelters said that they needed additional assistance in SNAP benefits and outreach.
- 71.4% of the pantries, 50.0% of the kitchens, and 0.0% of the shelters said that they needed additional assistance in summer feeding programs.





Note: Charts corresponding to tables that contain values of "n.p." or "N.A." (see section 3.7) may display the suppressed numbers in place of "n.p." or "N.A.". This is due to the limitation of the computer system used to generate the member-level reports. The parts of the chart for which this is true should be ignored.

APPENDIX A

PRECISION OF REPORTED ESTIMATES: SURVEY ERROR AND SAMPLING ERROR

Food banks should be aware that many of the estimates in the report are based on relatively small sample sizes and are subject to survey error, which includes statistical sampling error and error from the operational components of the survey (non-sampling error), such as nonresponse, reporting error and measurement error. While the sampling design and sample sizes can impose some control on the sampling error (and while this error can be quantified), the non-sampling error reflects the degree of success in designing the questionnaire and data collection procedures and in conducting the data collection activities at all stages. Unfortunately, the non-sampling error cannot be quantified. The exact amount of variation (both sampling error and non-sampling error) will be different for different food banks, and the relative contribution of sampling error and non-sampling error to the total survey error will also vary by food bank.

In general, food banks should be aware that, at a minimum, most of the percentages in the report are measured with sampling variation in the range of 8 to 12 percentage points.²⁷ For instance, if SNAP participation rates among households served by a food bank are estimated to be—say—32%, it is very likely that the margin of error at a minimum extends from 24% to 40% around the 32% estimate. Furthermore, in many instances this margin of error could be 12 percentage points or more, especially for subgroups with small sample sizes.

For estimates of annual numbers of clients, for most food banks the margin of error tends to be in the range of about 25% of the estimates. For instance if a food bank's providers are estimated to serve—say—100,000 different clients annually, the margin of error around this estimate would extent from about 75,000 to 125,000. In general, sampling error can depend on such factors as:

²⁷ Sampling variation is measured in these reports in terms of the 90% confidence interval around an estimate. The 90% confidence interval implies that, with 90% confidence, the true value of an estimate will be in the interval. These confidence intervals, however, do not account for the non-sampling error, which can increase (sometimes substantially) the size of the confidence interval.

- Overall number of clients interviewed
- The number of different providers of each type at which clients were interviewed
- The specific variable(s) being considered

The ranges of precision highlighted above focus only on sampling variation due to statistical sampling and the number of completed interviews. As noted previously, other forms of survey error (the non-sampling error) will increase overall survey error. These other forms of error include:

- **Nonresponse.** When completed interviews is obtained from only a portion of the clients selected for the survey
- **Response Error.** When the client interviewed does not provide an accurate answer to a question because the client either misunderstands the question or chooses not to provide an accurate answer
- **Reporting Error.** When counts or other information used in the sampling and other data collection activities are in error or missing
- **Measurement Error.** When the question in the questionnaire is not worded effectively to obtain the desired information from the client

These forms of error exist in all surveys, but the size of the non-sampling error (relative to the sampling error) depends on the design of the data collection activities and implementation of these by all persons involved in the survey.

SAMPLING ERROR UNDER DIFFERENT CIRCUMSTANCES

The food bank reports contain a wealth of information and an extensive number of estimates based on the survey data. While in general it is desirable and useful to provide detailed information on the sampling variation for all variables for each specific food bank and in the multiple food bank-level reports, this is not feasible and would potentially detract from the usefulness of the reports. To provide a useful measure of the extent of sampling error in the estimates, we have computed estimates of the statistical variation for selected variables to

identify the general range of sampling variation²⁸. Based on those calculations, we provide below some general guidelines that can be useful in helping food banks assess how much statistical variation is present in their estimates. The guidelines follow.²⁹

Guidelines for Estimated Percentages for All Clients or Only Pantry Clients

The largest sample sizes at the food bank level are for the overall client sample and for the subsample of pantry users. Following are guidelines for sampling variation for these groups:

Guideline 1. If you are considering a percentage estimate in the range of 30% to 70% and if the estimate is based on between 300 and 500 observations, then the margin of error is likely to be plus-or-minus about 8 percentage points.

Example 1. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank estimates the percentage of pantry households that include at least one working member as 30%. Also, suppose the sample size for pantry clients at that food bank is 330. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 22% and 38%.

Guideline 2. If you are considering a percentage estimate below 30% or above 70%, and if the estimate is based on between 300 and 500 observations, then the margin of error is likely to be plus-or-minus about 5 percentage points. (This is like Guideline 1 but with a different percentage range.)

Example 2. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank estimates the percentage of all households that include at least one member who is 65 years old or older. Suppose the estimate is 10%, and suppose the sample size for pantry clients at that food bank is 316. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 5% and 15%.

²⁸ As noted before, the measures of sampling variation do not account for non-sampling error.

²⁹ Estimates of the sampling variation are based on estimates computed using data analysis software design for complex surveys (SUDAAN) to estimate standard errors for selected estimates for each individual participating food banks. The estimates in this appendix reflect average standard errors across food banks. The calculations take into account clustering, differential sampling rates, and other aspects of the sampling design. The confidence intervals reported in the text are 90% confidence intervals.

Guideline 3. If you are considering a percentage estimate in the range of 30% to 70% and if the estimate is based on 100 to 300 observations, then the margin of error is plus-or-minus about 9 percentage points. (This is like Guideline 1 but with a different sample size.)

Example 3. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank estimates the percentage of pantry households that are food insecure to be 60%, and suppose the sample size for pantry clients at that food bank is 122. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 51% and 69%.

Guideline 4. If you are considering a percentage estimate below 30% or above 70%, and if the estimate is based on about 100 to 300 observations, then the margin of error is likely to be about plus-or-minus about 6 percentage points. (This is like Guideline 2 but with a different sample size.)

Example 4. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank has an estimate of 15% for the percentage of all households that include at least one member who is 65 years old or older. Suppose too that the sample size for pantry clients at that food bank is 220. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 9% and 21%.

Guidelines for Estimated Percentages for Clients at Kitchens or Shelters

The numbers of completed interviews at kitchens and shelters tend to be smaller and the estimates from these providers also inherently have greater statistical variation because of the frequency of operation. Following are guidelines for sampling variation for these groups:

For Kitchens

Guideline 5. If you are considering a percentage estimate for kitchens in the range of 30% to 70% and if the estimate is based on between 30 and 50 observations, then the margin of error is approximately plus-or-minus about 18 percentage points.

Example 5. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank include an estimate that 40% of the kitchen households include at least one working member. Also, suppose the sample size for kitchen clients at that food bank is 45. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 27% and 63%.

Guideline 6. If you are considering a percentage estimate for kitchens that is below 30% or above 70%, and if the estimate is based on between 30 and 50 observations, then the margin of error is plus-or-minus about 10 percentage points. (This is like Guideline 5 but with a different percentage range.)

Example 6. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank includes an estimate of the percentage of all households that include at least one member who is 65 years old or older. Suppose the estimate is 20%, and suppose the sample size for kitchen clients at that food bank is 43. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 10% and 30%.

Guideline 7. If you are considering a percentage estimate for kitchen clients in the range of 30% to 70% and if the estimate is based on more than 50 observations, then the margin of error is plus-or-minus about 16 percentage points. (This is like Guideline 5 but with a different sample size.)

Example 7. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank estimates the percentage of kitchen households that are food insecure to be 60%, and suppose the sample size for kitchen clients at that food bank is 87. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 44% and 76%.

Guideline 8. If you are considering a percentage estimate for kitchen clients that is below 30% or above 70%, and if the estimate is based on more than 50 completed interviews, then the margin of error is plus-or-minus about 10 percentage points. (This is like Guideline 6 but with a different sample size.)

Example 8. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank has an estimate of 22% for all kitchen households include at least one member who is 65 years old or older. Suppose too that the sample size for kitchen clients at that food bank is 58. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 12% and 32%.

For Shelters

Guideline 9. If you are considering a percentage estimate for a shelter in the range of 30% to 70% and if the estimate is based on more than 30 completed interviews, then the margin of error is plus-or-minus about 19 percentage points.

Example 9. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank estimates the percentage of shelter households which food insecure as 65%. Also, suppose the sample size for shelter clients at that food bank is 45. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 46% and 84%.

Guideline 10. If you are considering a percentage estimate for shelters that is below 30% or above 70%, and if the estimate is based on more than 30 observations, then the margin of error is plus-or-minus about 11 percentage points. (This is like Guideline 9 but with a different percentage range.)

Example 10. Suppose that the report for a specific food bank, there is the estimate of the percentage of shelter households that include at least one working member. Suppose the estimate is 20%, and suppose the sample size for shelter clients at that food bank is 43. Then we can be 90% confident that the true value lies between 9% and 31%.

Guidelines for Estimates of Numbers of Annual Clients

The food bank reports also include estimates of the numbers of *different* clients served by the food banks in a year. For the typical food bank with about 400 overall client observations, the margin of error is approximately plus-or-minus 25% of the estimate. For instance, if a food bank is estimated to have approximately 20,000 different clients annually, then the statistical margin of error extends between approximately 15,000 and 25,000 clients.

APPENDIX B
SNAP ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

For 2009, the following SNAP eligibility rules applied to households in the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia.³⁰

A. RESOURCES (RULES ON RESOURCE LIMITS)

Households may have \$2,000 in countable resources, such as a bank account, or \$3,000 in countable resources if at least one person is age 60 or older or is disabled. However, certain resources are *not* counted, such as a home and lot, the resources of people who receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI), the resources of people who receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (formerly AFDC), and most retirement (pension) plans.

A licensed vehicle is *not* counted if:

- It is used for income-producing purposes
- It is annually producing income consistent with its fair market value
- It is needed for long distance travel for work (other than daily commute)
- It is used as the home
- It is needed to transport a physically disabled household member
- It is needed to carry most of the household's fuel or water
- The household has little equity in the vehicle (because of money owed on the vehicle, it would bring no more than \$1,500 if sold)

For the following licensed vehicles, the fair market value over \$4,650 is counted:

- One per adult household member
- Any other vehicle a household member under 18 drives to work, school, job training, or to look for work

³⁰ This information is taken from http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/applicant_recipients/Eligibility.htm accessed on August 20, 2009.

For all other vehicles, the fair market value over \$4,650 or the equity value, whichever is more, is counted as a resource.

B. INCOME (RULES ON INCOME LIMITS)

Households must meet income tests *unless* all members are receiving Title IV (TANF), SSI, or, in some places, general assistance. Most households must meet both the gross and net income tests, but a household with an elderly person or a person who is receiving certain types of disability payments only has to meet the net income test. Gross income is equal to a household's total, nonexcluded income, before any deductions have been made. Net income is equal to gross income minus allowable deductions.

Households, except those noted, that have income over the amounts listed below cannot get SNAP benefits.

People in Household	Gross Monthly Income Limits	Net Monthly Income Limits
1	\$1,127	\$867
2	\$1,517	\$1,167
3	\$1,907	\$1,467
4	\$2,297	\$1,767
5	\$2,687	\$2,067
6	\$3,077	\$2,367
7	\$3,467	\$2,667
8	\$3,857	\$2,967
Each additional person	+\$390	+\$300

Note: Effective October 2008 through September 2009.

C. DEDUCTIONS (RULES ON ALLOWABLE DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME)

Deductions are allowed as follows (effective October 2008 through September 2009):

- A 20% deduction from earned income
- A standard deduction of \$144 for households of 1 to 3 people and \$147 for a household size of 4 (higher for larger households, and in Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam)

- A dependent care deduction when needed for work, training, or education
- Medical expenses for elderly or disabled members which are more than \$35 for the month if they are not paid by insurance or someone else
- Legally owed child support payments
- Some states allow homeless households a set amount (\$143) for shelter costs
- Excess shelter costs that are more than half the household's income after the other deductions. Allowable costs include the cost of fuel to heat and cook with, electricity, water, the basic fee for one telephone, rent or mortgage payments, and taxes on the home. The amount of the shelter deduction cannot be more than \$446 unless one person in the household is elderly or disabled. (The limit is higher in Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam.)

D. WORK AND ALIENS (RULES ON WORK, AND LEGAL IMMIGRANTS)

With some exceptions, able-bodied adults between 16 and 60 must register for work, accept suitable employment, and take part in an employment and training program to which they are referred by the SNAP office. Failure to comply with these requirements can result in disqualification from the program. In addition, able-bodied adults between 18 and 50 who do not have any dependent children can get SNAP benefits for only 3 months in a 36-month period if they do not work or participate in a workfare or employment and training program other than job search. This requirement is waived in some locations.

E. IMMIGRANT ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

The 2002 Farm bill restores SNAP eligibility to most legal immigrants that:

- Have lived in the country five years
- Are receiving disability-related assistance or benefits, regardless of entry date
- Starting October 1, 2003, are children regardless of entry date

Certain non-citizens, such as those admitted for humanitarian reasons and those admitted for permanent residence, are also eligible for the program. Eligible household members can get SNAP benefits even if there are other members of the household that are not eligible.

Non-citizens that are in the United States temporarily, such as students, are not eligible.

A number of states have their own programs to provide benefits to immigrants who do not meet the regular SNAP eligibility requirements.

APPENDIX C

SOURCES OF INFORMATION SHOWN IN THE CHARTS AND TABLES IN CHAPTERS 5 THROUGH 14

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
5.1.1	Client data	
5.2.1	2. Sex 3. Age 4. Relationship 5. Citizen 6. Employment 7. Are there any children age 0-5 years in household? 9. Are you married, living with someone as married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married? 10. What is the highest level of education you completed? 11. Are you Spanish, Latino, or of Hispanic descent or origin? 11a. Would that be Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, some other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino group? 12. What is your race? 81a. ZIP code 82. Are you a registered voter?	
5.3.1	2. Sex 3. Age 5. Citizen	
5.3.2	2. Sex 3. Age 5. Citizen 6a. Are there more than 10 people in the household? 6b. How many of those people are children less than 18 years old?	
5.4.1	9. Are you married, living with someone as married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married?	
5.5.1	10. What is the highest level of education you completed?	
5.6.1	11. Are you Spanish, Latino, or of Hispanic descent or origin? 11a. Would that be Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, some other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino group? 12. What is your race?	
5.7.1	3. Age 6. Employment	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
5.7.2	<p>6. Employment</p> <p>12a. Is respondent working?</p> <p>13. You mentioned that you are not working now. How long has it been since you worked?</p> <p>14a. Is this job a managerial or professional job?</p> <p>15. Are you participating in any gov't sponsored job training or work experience programs, such as the food stamp employment training program or any work program tied to your receipt of TANF?</p>	
5.8.1.1	Federal Poverty Level Table	
5.8.2.1	27a. What was your household's total income for last month?	
5.8.3.1	<p>27. What was your total income last month before taxes?</p> <p>28. What was your household's main source of income last month?</p>	
5.8.3.2	<p>6. Employment</p> <p>25. Did you get money in the <u>last month</u> from any of the following....?</p> <p>27. What was your total income last month before taxes?</p>	
5.8.4.1	29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?	
5.8.5.1	<p>10. What is the highest level of education you completed?</p> <p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
5.8.6.1	<p>3. Age</p> <p>6a. Are there more than 10 people in the household?</p> <p>6b. How many of those people are children less than 18 years old?</p> <p>6c. Does household include a grandchild?</p> <p>7. Are there any children age 0-5 years in household?</p> <p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p>	
5.9.1.1	<p>16. Please tell me the kind of place where you now live.</p> <p>17. Do you own, rent, live free with someone else?</p> <p>18. Were you late paying your last month's rent or mortgage?</p> <p>81. Does your household receive Section 8 or Public Housing Assistance?</p>	
5.9.1.2	<p>16. Please tell me the kind of place where you now live.</p> <p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p>	
5.9.1.3	<p>16. Please tell me the kind of place where you now live.</p> <p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p>	
5.9.2.1	<p>19. Do you have access to a place to prepare a meal, a working telephone, and a car that runs?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.1.1.1	<p>42. “The food I/we bought just didn’t last, and I/we didn’t have money to get more.” (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. “I/We couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals.” (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn’t enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn’t enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn’t eat because you couldn’t afford enough food?</p>	
6.1.1.2	<p>6b. How many of those people are children less than 18 years old?</p> <p>42. “The food I/we bought just didn’t last, and I/we didn’t have money to get more.” (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. “I/We couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals.” (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn’t enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn’t enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn’t eat because you couldn’t afford enough food?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.1.1.3	<p>7. Are there any children age 0-5 years in household?</p> <p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.1.1.4	<p>3. Age</p> <p>6a. Are there more than 10 people in the household?</p> <p>6b. How many of those people are children less than 18 years old?</p> <p>6c. Does household include a grandchild?</p> <p>7. Are there any children age 0-5 years in household?</p> <p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p>	
6.1.2.1	<p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.1.3.1	<p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p> <p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p>	
6.1.3.2	<p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p> <p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.1.4.1	<p>20. Would you say your own health is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?</p> <p>21. Does person live alone?</p> <p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p>	
6.1.5.1	<p>5. Citizen</p> <p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.1.5.2	<p>5. Citizen</p> <p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p>	
6.2.1	<p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p>	
6.2.2	<p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p> <p>31. Are you (or others in your household) receiving Food Stamps (SNAP) now?</p> <p>42. "The food I/we bought just didn't last, and I/we didn't have money to get more." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>43. "I/We couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.3.1	<p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p> <p>47. In the last 12 months, did you ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?</p>	
6.3.2	<p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p> <p>31. Are you (or others in your household) receiving Food Stamps (SNAP) now?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p> <p>47. In the last 12 months, did you ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.4.1	<p>3. Age</p> <p>6b. How many of the other people in your household are children less than 18 years old?</p> <p>49. "My child was not eating enough because I/we just couldn't afford enough food." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>50. In the last 12 months, did your child ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>51. In the last 12 months, was your child ever hungry but you just couldn't afford more food?</p>	
6.4.2	<p>29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?</p> <p>31. Are you (or others in your household) receiving Food Stamps (SNAP) now?</p> <p>49. "My child was not eating enough because I/we just couldn't afford enough food." (Often, sometimes, never true)</p> <p>50. In the last 12 months, did your child ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>51. In the last 12 months, was your child ever hungry but you just couldn't afford more food?</p>	
6.5.1	<p>52. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household every had to choose between: paying for food and paying for medicine or medical care; paying for food and paying for utilities or heating fuel; paying for food and paying for rent or mortgage?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
6.5.2	<p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p> <p>52. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household every had to choose between: paying for food and paying for medicine or medical care; paying for food and paying for utilities or heating fuel; paying for food and paying for rent or mortgage?</p>	
6.5.3	<p>44. In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?</p> <p>44a. How often did this happen?</p> <p>45. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?</p> <p>46. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?</p> <p>52. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household every had to choose between: paying for food and paying for medicine or medical care; paying for food and paying for utilities or heating fuel; paying for food and paying for rent or mortgage?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
7.1.1	<p>30. Have you ever applied for SNAP benefits?</p> <p>31. Are you receiving SNAP benefits now?</p> <p>32. Did you receive SNAP benefits in the past 12 months?</p> <p>34. How long have you been receiving SNAP benefits?</p> <p>35. How many weeks do your SNAP benefits usually last?</p>	
7.1.2	<p>3. Age</p> <p>6a. Are there more than 10 people in the household?</p> <p>6b. How many of those people are children less than 18 years old?</p> <p>6c. Does household include a grandchild?</p> <p>7. Are there any children age 0-5 years in household?</p> <p>30. Have you ever applied for SNAP benefits?</p> <p>31. Are you receiving SNAP benefits now?</p> <p>32. Did you receive SNAP benefits in the past 12 months?</p> <p>34. How long have you been receiving SNAP benefits?</p> <p>35. How many weeks do your SNAP benefits usually last?</p>	
7.2.1	36. Why haven't you applied for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program?	
7.2.2	<p>3. Age</p> <p>6a. Are there more than 10 people in the household?</p> <p>6b. How many of those people are children less than 18 years old?</p> <p>6c. Does household include a grandchild?</p> <p>7. Are there any children age 0-5 years in household?</p> <p>36. Why haven't you applied for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program?</p>	
7.3.1	33. Why don't you receive SNAP benefits now?	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
7.3.2	<p>3. Age</p> <p>6a. Are there more than 10 people in the household?</p> <p>6b. How many of those people are children less than 18 years old?</p> <p>6c. Does household include a grandchild?</p> <p>7. Are there any children age 0-5 years in household?</p> <p>33. Why don't you receive SNAP benefits now?</p>	
7.3.3	33. Why don't you receive SNAP benefits now?	
7.3.4	33. Why don't you receive SNAP benefits now?	
7.4.1	<p>7a. Do any of your younger-than-school-age children go to day care?</p> <p>8. Does the government pay part of the cost of day care?</p> <p>39. In which, if any, of the following programs do you currently participate?</p> <p>41. Did the child(ren) in your household participate in the summer food programs providing free lunches for child(ren) in the summer of 2008?</p>	
7.4.2	<p>41. Did the child(ren) in your household participate in the summer food programs providing free lunches for child(ren) in the summer of 2008?</p> <p>41a. Why didn't the child(ren) in your household participate in the summer food program?</p>	
7.5.1	26. Did you receive general assistance, welfare, or TANF at any time in the <u>past two years</u> ?	
7.6.1	38. Where do you do <u>most</u> of your grocery shopping?	
8.1.1	<p>20. Would you say your own health is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?</p> <p>21. Is anyone in your household in poor health?</p>	

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
8.2.1	22a-f. Do you have any of the following kinds of health insurance? 23. Do you have unpaid medical or hospital bills? 24. In the past 12 months, have you been refused medical care because you could not pay or because you had a Medicaid or Medical Assistance card?	
8.2.2	22b. Do you have...State Medical Assistance Program or Medicaid? 29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?	
8.2.3	22a-f. Do you have any of the following kinds of health insurance? 29. What was your household's total income before taxes and other deductions <u>last year</u> from all sources, including Social Security and other gov't programs?	
9.1.1	56. How many different food pantries gave you food in the past month? 57. How many different soup kitchens gave you meals in the past month?	
9.2.1	53. Please rate how satisfied you are with the food that you and others in your household receive here. 54. When you come here, how often are you treated with respect by the staff who distribute food?	
9.3.1	55. If this agency weren't here to help you with food, what would you do?	
10.1.1		Agency data
10.2.1		1. Record the total number of emergency shelters, pantries, kitchens, and other programs you currently operate.
10.3.1		1. Record the total number of emergency shelters, pantries, kitchens, and other programs you currently operate.
10.4.1		3b. In what year did each selected program open?
10.5.1		4. For each selected program, please indicate which of the following services, if any, are currently being provided.

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
10.5.2		4. For each selected program, please indicate which of the following services, if any, are currently being provided.
10.5.3		26. Please indicate which of the following programs or facilities your agency operates
10.6.1		27. Type of agency.
10.7.1		18. Do the selected programs currently serve any of the following groups?
10.8.1		7. Compared to 3 years ago, that is, 2006, is this program providing food to more, fewer, same number of clients?
10.9.1		19. In which of the following ways does the client mix change during the year for any of the selected programs?
11.1.1		6. During a typical week, approximately how many meals are served and/or bags or boxes of food distributed by each of the selected programs?
11.2.1		6b. How many different persons or households did you serve on the last day you were open? And how many meals were served and/or bags or boxes of food distributed by each of the selected programs on that day?
11.2.2		6b. How many different persons or households did you serve on the last day you were open? And how many meals were served and/or bags or boxes of food distributed by each of the selected programs on that day? 27. Type of agency.
12.1.1		17. Is the continued operation of the selected programs threatened by one or more serious problems?
12.1.2		17. Is the continued operation of the selected programs threatened by one or more serious problems? 27. Type of agency.
12.2.1		13. During the past year, about how often did each of the selected programs have to reduce meal portions or reduce the quantity of food in food packages because of a lack of food?

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
12.2.2		13. During the past year, about how often did each of the selected programs have to reduce meal portions or reduce the quantity of food in food packages because of a lack of food?
12.3.1		9. During the past year, did the selected programs turn away any clients for <u>any</u> reason? 10. For which of the following reasons did each selected program turn clients away? 12. During the past year, approximately how many clients did each selected program turn away?
12.3.2		11. What were each selected program's two most frequent reasons for turning away clients?
12.4.1		14. In your opinion, during a <i>typical week</i> , how much <i>more</i> food, if any, does each of the selected programs need in order to adequately meet their demand for food? Your best estimate is fine.
13.1.1		8. For each selected program, approximately what percent of the distributed food comes from the food bank? 8a. Do the selected programs distribute government or USDA commodities from CSFP, TEFAP, or FDIRP? 8b. Approximately what percent of the distributed food comes from other sources?
13.1.2		8. For each selected program, approximately what percent of the distributed food comes from the food bank? 8a. Do the selected programs distribute government or USDA commodities from CSFP, TEFAP, or FDIRP? 8b. Approximately what percent of the distributed food comes from other sources? 27. Type of agency.

Table	Client Question	Agency Question
13.1.3		<p>8. For each selected program, approximately what percent of the distributed food comes from the food bank?</p> <p>8a. Do the selected programs distribute government or USDA commodities from CSFP, TEFAP, or FDIRP?</p> <p>8b. Approximately what percent of the distributed food comes from other sources?</p> <p>13. During the past year, about how often did each of the selected programs have to reduce meal portions or reduce the quantity of food in food packages because of a lack of food?</p>
13.2.1		<p>15. Currently, how many <u>paid</u> staff are employed by each of the selected programs?</p> <p>16. During the past week, how many volunteers assisted and the number of volunteer hours for each selected program.</p> <p>26. Please indicate which of the following programs or facilities your agency operates</p>
13.3.1		<p>22. Please indicate for each selected program, which of the following categories of products are <u>purchased</u> with cash from sources other than your food bank?</p>
14.1.1		<p>23. What categories of food and non-food products do you <u>need</u> that you are not getting now, or need more of from your food bank to meet your clients' needs?</p>
14.2.1		<p>24. If the food supply you receive from your food bank were eliminated, how much of an impact would this have on your program?</p>
14.3.1		<p>25. Does your program need additional assistance in any of the following areas?</p>

APPENDIX D

**HUNGER IN AMERICA TABLE CROSSWALK FOR NATIONAL REPORT AND
LOCAL REPORTS (WHERE APPLICABLE), 2005 TO 2009**

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
<u>CHAPTER 2</u>				
	No Tables in this Chapter			
<u>CHAPTER 3</u>				
	No Tables in this Chapter			
<u>CHAPTER 4</u>				
4.2.1	Estimates of Numbers of Different Clients Served by the FA Network			
4.3.1	Estimated Number of Pantries in the FA Network			
4.4.1	Derivation of Estimate of Different People Using Pantries Annually			
4.5.1	Estimated Number of Kitchens in the FA Network			
4.6.1	Derivation of Estimate of Different People Using Kitchens Annually			
4.7.1	Estimated Number of Shelters in the FA Network			
4.7.2	Derivation of Estimate of Different People Using Shelters Annually			
4.8.1	Estimated Annual Clients Unduplicated across Agencies			
<u>CHAPTER 5</u>				
5.1.1	Number of Client Respondents			

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
5.2.1	Summary Demographic Profile of Clients			Two new rows added "Households with Grandchildren" and "Households with a respondent who provides basic needs to grandchild, among households with a grandchild"
5.3.1	Age, Gender, and Citizenship Composition (Adult Clients at Program Sites)			
5.3.2	Age, Gender, and Citizenship Composition (All Household Members at Program Sites)			
5.3.2N	Age Composition (Estimated Number of Clients)			
5.4.1	Marital Status			
5.5.1	Highest Education Level Attained			
5.6.1	Racial and Ethnic Background			
5.7.1	Employment Status of Adults in Household			
5.7.2	Detailed Employment Status of Adults in Household			
5.7.2N	Estimated Number of Employed Adults, Full-Time and Part-Time			
5.8.1.1	The 2009 Federal Income Level--Monthly Income			
5.8.2.1	Household Income for the Previous Month			
5.8.3.1	Main Source of Household Income for the Previous Month			
5.8.3.2	All Sources of Household Income for Previous Month			
5.8.4.1	Household Income for 2008			

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
5.8.4.1N	Estimated Number of Client Households Receiving TANF or GA During Previous Month			
5.8.5.1	Income in 2008, by Education	15.3.3		
5.8.6.1	Income in 2009, by Presence of Elderly or Children	15.3.5		
5.9.1.1	Housing Status			Added new row "motel/hotel" for choices under "Clients with a place to live"
5.9.1.1N	Estimated Number of Clients with or without a Place to Live			
5.9.1.2	Income in 2008, by Housing Status	15.3.1		
5.9.1.3	Income in 2008, by Home Ownership	15.3.2		
5.9.1.4	Household Resources	5.9.2.1		
CHAPTER 6				
6.1.1.1	Household Food Insecurity	6.1.1		
6.1.1.1N	Estimated Number of Households by Food Security Status	6.1.1N		
6.1.1.2	Food Security, By Presence of Children	15.2.4		
6.1.1.3	Food Security, By Presence of Young Children	15.2.5		
6.1.1.4	Food Security, By Presence of Elderly or Children	15.2.6		
6.1.2.1	Food Security, by Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation	6.1.2 and 15.2.3		
6.1.2.1N	Estimated Number of Households by Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation and Food Security Status	6.1.2N		
6.1.3.1	Food Security, By Income in 2008	15.2.1		
6.1.3.2	Income in 2008, by Food Security Status	15.3.4		

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
6.1.4.1	Food Security, by Health Status	15.2.2		
6.1.5.1	Food Security, by Citizenship Status	15.2.7		
6.1.5.2	Food Security among Households Containing at Least One Noncitizen, by Presence of Young Children	15.2.8		
6.2.1	Indicators of Food Insecurity in Households			
6.2.1N	Estimated Number of Households, by Indicators of Food Security			
6.2.2	Indicators of Food Insecurity in Households, by Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Receipt	15.7.1		
6.3.1	Indicators of Food Insecurity Among Adults			
6.3.1N	Estimated Number of Households, by Indicators of Food Security Among Adults			
6.3.2	Indicators of Food Insecurity Among Adults, by Receipt of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits		New	
6.3.3	Indicators of Food Insecurity Among Adults, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
6.4.1	Indicators of Food Insecurity Among Children			
6.4.1.N	Estimated Number of Client Households with Children, by Food Security Status			
6.4.2	Indicators of Food Insecurity and Hunger Among Children, by Receipt of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits		New	
6.4.3	Indicators of Food Insecurity and Hunger Among Children, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
6.5.1	Choice between Food and Necessities			Add two rows corresponding to two new 2009 questions (1) paying for food and paying for transportation and (2) paying for food and paying for gas for a car.
				Also, changed the last three rows of the table to say: "HHs with all 5 of these situations", "HHs with 4 out of the 5 situations", "HHs with 3 out of the 5 situations", "HHs with 2 out of the 5 situations", "HHs with only 1 of the situations"
6.5.2	Household Tradeoffs, by Food Security Status	15.5.1		Add two rows corresponding to two new 2009 questions (1) paying for food and paying for transportation and (2) paying for food and paying for gas for a car.

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
6.5.3	Household Tradeoffs, by Household Structure	15.5.2		Add two rows corresponding to two new 2009 questions (1) paying for food and paying for transportation and (2) paying for food and paying for gas for a car.
CHAPTER 7				
7.1.1	Use of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program			
7.1.1N	Use of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Client Counts)			
7.1.2	Use of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program , by Presence of Elderly or Children		New	
7.1.3	Use of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program , by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
7.2.1	Reasons Why Clients Never Applied for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits			Added 4 new rows corresponding to categories (SNAP office is not open when I am available; SNAP office does not offer services in my language, Didn't want to be fingerprinted, nowhere to redeem benefits) to the "Inconveniences" section. Removed "need is only temporary" from "No Need" section as it was not asked in 2009.
7.2.2	Reasons Why Clients Never Applied for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits, by Presence of Elderly or Children	15.6.2		
7.2.3	Reasons Why Clients Never Applied for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
7.3.1	Reasons Why Clients or Their Households are not Currently Receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits, For Those Who Have Applied			
7.3.2	Reasons Why Clients or Their Households are not Currently Receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits, For Those Who Have Applied, by Presence of Elderly or Children	15.6.1		

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
7.3.3	Reasons Why Clients or Their Households are not Currently Receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits, For Those Who Have Applied, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
7.3.4	Reported Income Levels of Clients Who Indicated Ineligible Income as a Reason for not Receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits	7.3.2		
7.3.5	Reported Income Levels of Clients Who Indicated Ineligible Income as a Reason for not Receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits, by Presence of Elderly or Children		New	
7.3.6	Reported Income Levels of Clients Who Indicated Ineligible Income as a Reason for not Receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
7.4.1	Use of Other Programs			Added backpack weekend food program as a row.
7.4.2	Use of Other Programs, by Urban/Metropolitan status		New	
7.4.3	Reasons Why Child didn't Participate in Summer Food Program		New	
7.4.4	Reasons Why Child didn't Participate in Summer Food Program, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
7.5.1	General Assistance, Welfare, and TANF in the Previous Two Years			
7.6.1	Grocery Shopping Patterns			Added "dollar stores" as a separate row in table.
CHAPTER 8				
8.1.1	Health Status			
8.2.1	Health Insurance and Access to Medical Care			

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
8.2.1N	Estimated Number of Clients at Program Sites who had been Refused Medical Care			
8.2.2	Income in 2008, by Medicaid Participation Status	15.3.6		
8.2.3	Income in 2008, by Uninsured Status		New	
CHAPTER 9				
9.1.1	Number of Different Pantries or Kitchens Used			
9.2.1	Satisfaction with Services at Food Programs			
9.2.2	Satisfaction with Services at Food Programs, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
9.3.1	What Clients Would Do Without Food Assistance from the Agency			
CHAPTER 10				
10.1.1	Programs Reported on by Participating Agencies, by Program Type			
10.2.1	Number of Programs Operated by Agencies			
10.3.1	Agencies Operating Various Types of Programs			
10.4.1	Length of Program Operation			
10.4.2	Length of Program operations, by Urban/Metropolitan status		New	
10.5.1	Other Services or Facilities Agencies or Programs Provide in Addition to Food Distribution, by Program Type			
10.5.2	Other Services or Facilities Agencies or Programs Provide in Addition to Food Distribution, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
10.5.3	Number of Additional Services, by Program Type	10.5.2		
10.5.4	Other Facilities Agencies Provide in Addition to Food Distribution, by Program Type	10.5.3		Added "CSFP" as row in table.
10.6.1	Type of Agency that Operates the Program			
10.6.2	Type of Agency that Operates the Program, by Urban/Metropolitan status		New	

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
10.7.1	Programs Serving Selected Types of Clients			
10.8.1	Agency Estimates of Change in Number of Clients from 2006 to 2009			
10.9.1	Seasonality of Client Mix			
10.9.2	Seasonality of Client Mix, by Urban/Metropolitan status		New	
CHAPTER 11				
11.1.1	Number of Boxes or Bags Distributed in Typical Week			
11.2.1	Amount of Food Served on the Day the Program was Last Open			
11.2.2	Amount of Food Served on the Day the Program was Last Open, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
11.2.3	Amount of Food Served on the Day the Program was Last Open, by Type of Agency that Operates the Program		New	
CHAPTER 12				
12.1.1	Stability of Existing Food Programs			
12.1.2	Stability of Existing Food Programs, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
12.1.3	Stability of Existing Food Programs, by Type of Agency that Operates the Program		New	
12.2.1	Frequency of Stretching Food Resources			
12.2.1N	Estimated Number of Programs Having to Stretch Food Resources			
12.2.2	Frequency of Stretching Food Resources, by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
12.2.3	Frequency of Stretching Food Resources, by Type of Agency that Operates the Program		New	
12.3.1	Programs that Turned Away Clients			
12.3.2	Most Frequent Reasons the Program Turned Away Clients			
12.4.1	Additional Food Resources Needed Per Week			

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
CHAPTER 13				
13.1.1	Sources of Food Distributed			Added row for "Food distribution program on Indian Reservation (FDIRP)"
13.1.2	Percentage of Food Received from Food Bank , by Urban/Metropolitan Status		New	
13.1.3	Percentage of Food Received from Food Bank , by Type of Agency that Operates the Program		New	
13.1.4	Percentage of Food Received from Food Bank , by Frequency of Stretching Food Resources		New	
13.2.1	Staff and Volunteer Resources			
13.2.1N	Estimated Number of Volunteer and Volunteer Hours during Previous Week			
13.3.1	Products Purchased from Sources Other than Food Bank			
CHAPTER 14				
14.1.1	Products Needed from Food Banks			
14.2.1	Impact of Elimination of Food Bank			
14.3.1	Areas of Additional Assistance Desired			Added two new rows: "SNAP Benefits and Outreach" and "Summer Feeding Programs"
CHAPTER 15				
15.1.1	Selected Client Characteristics in National Data: 1993, 1997, 2001, 2005, and 2009	16.1.1		
15.2.1	Selected Agency Characteristics in 1993, 1997, 2001, 2005, and 2009	16.2.1		

Table Number in 2010 Report	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
CHAPTER 16				
16.1.1	Changes in Demographic Characteristics		New	
16.1.2	Changes in Employment and Income Characteristics		New	
16.2.1	Changes in Food Security		New	
16.2.2	Changes in Food Security, by Presence of Elderly or Children		New	
16.2.3	Changes in Food Security, by Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation and Eligibility Status		New	
16.2.4	Changes in Household Trade-Offs Between Food and Necessities, by Food Security Status		New	
16.3.1	Changes in the Use of Federal Food Assistance Programs		New	
16.3.2	Changes in the Reasons Why Clients or their Households are not Currently Receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits, For Those Who Have Applied		New	
16.4.1	Changes in Health Status		New	
16.5.1	Changes in the Number of Different Pantries or Kitchens Used		New	
16.5.2	Changes in the Satisfaction with Services at Food Programs		New	
16.6.1	Changes in the Types of Agency that Operates the Program		New	
16.6.2	Changes in Agency or Program Provision of Other Services in Addition to Food Distribution		New	
16.6.3	Changes in the Frequency of Stretching Food Resources		New	
16.6.4	Changes in the Sources of Food Distributed by Programs		New	
16.6.5	Changes in Staff and Volunteer Resources During Previous Week		New	
16.6.6	Changes in Products Purchased from Sources Other than Food Bank		New	

Table Number in 2010	Table Title	Table Number in 2006 Report (if different than in 2010)	New Table in 2010 Report	Rows added in 2010 to existing 2006 Tables
16.6.7	Changes in Products Needed from Food Banks		New	